

SPEECH MONOGRAPHS

Published by
THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Volume XXI—No. 4

November, 1954

Dutch Treatises on Preaching: A List of Books and Articles . . .	235
HARRY CAPLAN and HENRY H. KING	
An Experimental Study of the Effect of Three Speech Variables on Listener Comprehension	248
K. C. BEIGHLEY	
A Case Study in Deliberative Persuasion: John Marshall's Congressional Speech on Jonathan Robbins	254
GALE L. RICHARDS	
The Effects of the Prestige of the Speaker and Acknowledgment of Opposing Arguments on Audience Retention and Shift of Opinion	267
STANLEY F. PAULSON	
Tension Patterns During Stuttering in Relation to Conflict, Anxiety-Binding, and Reinforcement	272
JOSEPH G. SHEEHAN and ROBERT B. VOAS	
The Persistency of the Effect on Audience Attitude of the First Versus the Second Argumentative Speech of a Series	280
HARVEY CROMWELL	
"Not for the Purpose of Making a Speech:" Andrew Johnson's Swing Around the Circle	285
GREGG PHIFER	
The Relative Frequency of Occurrence of English Consonant Sounds in Words in the Speech of Children in Grades One, Two, and Three	294
JOHN B. MADER	
The Loudness of Side-Tone	301
JOHN W. BLACK	
Index to Volume XXI	307

SUGGESTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTORS TO SPEECH MONOGRAPHS

SPEECH MONOGRAPHS was established to provide publication of scholarly research articles in the field of speech, derived from original sources or objective studies, and adding significantly to the knowledge of scholars.

Articles in SPEECH MONOGRAPHS have usually ranged from 4,000 to 8,000 words, with a large number below that minimum. The 8,000 word maximum will prevail; time will be saved in publishing if longer manuscripts are not submitted. Contributors are urged to consider whether their manuscripts can be reduced to 1,200-2,000 words, in order to provide space for a larger number of short articles.

Manuscripts should give evidence that the author is familiar with literature bearing on his research problem. It is not necessary, however, to review all this literature. Manuscripts should focus on the statement of the problem, the procedure used in securing the data, analysis of the data, and conclusions. While the inclusion of research data is important, it should be presented concisely. Long tables, graphs, and figures are expensive to print; keeping them to a minimum will make possible the publishing of more articles. Tables should be on separate pages, following the manuscript pages on which they are discussed.

Contributors should have their manuscripts read by competent critics before submitting them for publication. When manuscripts are parts or condensations of dissertations, that fact should be indicated, with the name of the director of the original research, in a footnote. In such cases, the director of the original research should review the manuscript. All copy should be proofread by at least one person besides the author before being submitted for publication. The number of words in the copy should be noted in the upper right-hand corner of the first page. Titles should be typed in full capitals, with the author's name, in capitals, two spaces below. The author's affiliation, school or college (or home city, if he is not so affiliated), should appear, with normal capitalization, underlined, two spaces below his name. Authors should retain a duplicate manuscript for their own protection. Editorial processing of manuscripts will be expedited if a carbon copy is submitted at the same time as the original.

All manuscripts must conform to the *MLA Style Sheet*. Reprints of this style sheet may be obtained from the Editor of SPEECH MONOGRAPHS, or from the Treasurer, Modern Language Association, 100 Washington Square East, New York 3, New York. Price: 10 cents.

Manuscripts will be read by the Editor and members of the Editorial Board before a final decision is made. Accepted manuscripts will be published in approximately the order of their acceptance. The deadline for submitting final revision of accepted manuscripts is two months before the date of issue. Publication dates are March, June, August, and November. Contributors should inform the Editor of changes in address to expedite the delivery of manuscripts or proofs.

Reprint order blanks are sent to authors with galley proofs; orders should be placed at once with the Artcraft Press, Columbia, Missouri. Reprints cannot be secured later.

All manuscripts should be submitted to J. Jeffery Auer, Editor of SPEECH MONOGRAPHS, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.

SPEECH MONOGRAPHS

VOLUME XXI—No. 4

NOVEMBER, 1954

DUTCH TREATISES ON PREACHING: A LIST OF BOOKS AND ARTICLES

HARRY CAPLAN and HENRY H. KING
Cornell University

THIS list¹ is sixth in a series: a Latin list appeared in *The Harvard Theological Review* 42 (1949), 185-206; an Italian list in *Speech Monographs* 16 (1949), 243-252; a Spanish, *ibid.* 17 (1950), 161-170; a French in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 36 (1950), 291-325; and a Scandinavian in *Speech Monographs* 21 (1954), 1-9. The reader is referred to the introductory remarks in these articles for an explanation of our purposes, and of the methods we have followed in compiling the lists.

With respect to the present list a few facts are noteworthy: 1) the virtual non-existence of treatises composed in the Dutch language in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries does not indicate that the Dutch were inactive in this field; rather, they wrote their treatises in Latin;² 2) in the eighteenth century, and especially in the nineteenth, translations of foreign treatises were popular in the Netherlands—treatises of German, French, and English authorship

being favored, in that order; 3) during the twentieth century some of the best material has appeared in periodicals; 4) we have listed two novels as contributions to history and criticism (see L. L. F. Bungener, nineteenth century, and Harald Hornborg, twentieth century).

To aid American and English investigators we have included in our list several journals and encyclopedias.

For items concerning which complete data have proved unavailable reference is made in abbreviated form to the following works:

Arrenberg, 1600-1787. *Naamregister van de bekendste en meest in gebruik zynde nederduitsche boeken, welke sedert het jaar 1600 tot het jaar 1761 zyn uitgekomen . . . voorheen uitgegeven door Johannes van Abkoude . . . nu overzien, verbeterd en tot het jaar 1787 vermeerderd door Reinier Arrenberg* (Rotterdam 1788).

Arrenberg, 1790-1831. *Alphabetische naamlijst van boeken, welke sedert het jaar 1790 tot en met het jaar 1831, in Noord-Nederland zyn uitgekomen . . . strekkende ten vervolge op het Naamregister van nederduitsche boeken van R. Arrenberg* ('s Gravenhage and Amsterdam 1832).

Bibl. Réd. De Meulemeester, Maurice, c.ss.r.: *Bibliographie générale des écrivains rédemptoristes*. Louvain 1933-1939 (3 vols.).

Brinkman, 1833-1849, 1850-1862, 1863-1875. *Alphabetische naamlijst van*

¹ The compilers wish to thank Mr. Coenraad H. H. ter Kuile for help with the proofs.

² See, in the Latin list, for saec. XVI: Alardus Amstelodamus, Georgius Cassander, Petrus Colpinus, Desiderius Erasmus, A. G. Hyperius, Jacobus Jansonius; for saec. XVII: J. H. Alsted, Arnoldus Olorinus (Cygnaeus), Heinrich von Diest, Johannes Hoornbeek, Johannes Martinus, Lodewijk van Wolzogen; also for saec. XVIII: Salomon van Til and Campegius Viringa, the elder. It is, however, surprising that (so far as the present compilers know) Erasmus' *Ecclesiastes* was never rendered into Dutch.

boeken, plaat- en kaartwerken (Amsterdam, C. L. Brinkman, 1858, 1868, 1878).

Brinkman, 1932. *Januari-December 1932: Brinkman's cumulatieve catalogus van boeken . . . bewerkt door G. J. van der Lek*, 87th year (Leiden, date not given).

N. *Nederlandsch Biogr. Woordenb.*
Nieuw Nederlandsch Biographisch

Woordenboek. Leiden 1911-1937 (10 vols.).

Niceron. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres dans la république des lettres*. Paris 1727-1745 (43 vols., by J. P. Niceron, P. F. Oudin, J. B. Michault, and C. P. Goujet).

P. following an author's name indicates his affiliation to some branch of the Protestant church, R.C. membership in the Roman Catholic church.

SIXTEENTH CENTURY

ADRIAENSZ, CORNELIS (1521-1581). R.C. See de Schrevel, A. C., in 20th-century list, below.

COSTERUS, FRANCISCUS, S.J. (1532-1619). R.C. See Hardeman, Father, *ibid.*

PETRUS CANISIUS (KANNEES, KANYS, probably also DE HONDT), Saint (1521-1597). R.C. See Stoks, Martin, *ibid.*

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

COSTERUS, FLORENTIUS (d. 1703). P. *De getrouwe predikant, uitgebeeld in eene predikatie op de bevestiging van Ds. Antonius Deynoot, in zijn dienst te Obdam, den 26en December 1677, over 1 Timoth. 4 vers 16*. Charlois 1893.

[VAN] SANTVOORT, ABRAHAM (d. 1669).

P. See Schneider, H., and Juten, F. G., in 20th-century list, below.

VAN TIL, SALOMON (1643-1713). P. *Predikorde of Handleiding om eene Predikatie wel te hooren en te harhalen*. Rotterdam 1730. Cf. his *Methodus concionandi* (Dordrecht 1688, Franeker 1712, Frankfurt 1717, Utrecht 1717).

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

VAN DER AA, CHRISTIANUS CAROLUS HENRICUS (1718-1793). P. See Reinbeck, J. G., below.

ANONYMOUS. *Aanmerkingen over het lezen der leerredenen, en hoe hetzelfde te bepalen, of voor te komen*. Leeuwarden 1790, 2d ed. (Arrenberg, 1790-1831, p. 2).

ANONYMOUS. P. *Gedachten over het predikamt in de Gereformeerde kerk*. Leeuwarden 1794; 1804 (sequel to the same). Arrenberg, *ibid.*, p. 184.

ANONYMOUS. *Verhandeling over het gebrek aan predikanten*. Place of publication unknown to us, 1791 (Arrenberg, *ibid.*, p. 623).

DE BAKKER, JOANNES. P. *Kort onderwijs om wel te prediken*. Amsterdam 1712, 1732.

BAUMGARTEN, SIEGMUND JAKOB (1706-1757). P. *Aanleiding om stigtelyk te prediken*. Amsterdam 1771 (tr. from the German). In German original (*Anweisung zum erbaulichen Predigen*): Frankfurt 1752.

BRAND, JOHANN PAUL (1701-1743). P. *Inleiding tot de hedendaagsche predikwys*. Amsterdam 1742.

In German (*Einleitung zur Erkenntniss und Gebrauch des heut zu Tage in einem grossen Theile der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche gebräuchlichen methodi concionandi*): Frankfurt 1766.

VAN DAVERVELDT, JACOB FERDINAND (1685-1759). P. *Leerreden op zyn vyftigjarigen predikdienst uit I Sam. vii: 12*. Utrecht 1758.

FÉNELON, FRANÇOIS DE SALIGNAC DE LA MOTHE, archbishop of Cambrai (1651-1715). R.C. *Gesprekken over de welsprekendheid in het algemeen, en over die van den kansel in het bijzonder*. Tr. from the French by J. M. Schrant. Amsterdam 1817.

In French original (*Dialogues sur l'éloquence en général et sur celle de la chaire en particulière*): Paris 1718, 1753, 1803, 1824, 1825, 1839, 1846, 1850, 1854, 1867, 1878, Amsterdam 1717, 1718. For details of these editions see 'French tractates on preaching,' in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 36, 3 (October 1950). 304. In English (*Dialogues on eloquence in general and that of the pulpit in particular*, tr. from

- the French by William Stevenson): London 1722, 1808, 1810, 1847 (tr. with a preliminary essay by Alfred Jenour), 1848, 1849, (ed. by Jenour), 1896, (and Philadelphia) 1897 (tr. by S. J. Eales), Glasgow 1750, 1760, Boston 1810, 1832 (in George Campbell, *Lectures on systematic theology and pulpit eloquence*, followed by *Dialogues on eloquence* by M. de Fénelon), 1819 (in Ebenezer Porter, compiler, *Young preacher's manual*), New York, 1814, Andover, Mass. 1845 (in Edwards Amasa Park, editor, *Preacher and pastor*, by Fénelon, Herbert, Baxter, Campbell), Philadelphia 1901, Princeton 1951 (tr. by W. S. Howell). See Winifred Holtby, *Eutychus, or The future of the pulpit: a possible epilogue to Fénelon's 'Dialogues sur l'éloquence'*, London 1928.
- In German (*Gespräche von der Beredsamkeit*): Halle 1734, Leipzig 1781-1782 (in *Sämtliche Werke*, tr. from the French), Münster 1803, 1819, Tübingen 1809, Regensburg 1837-1839 (in *Sämtliche Schriften*), Augsburg 1850 (in *Homiletik*, ed. by Stephan M. Arthur Franke).
- In Spanish (*Dialogos sobre la elocuencia en general y sobre la sagrada en particular*, tr. from the French): Madrid 1795, 1904.
- FORDYCE, JAMES (1720-1796). P. *Verhandel- ing over de Engelsche predikwyze*. Tr. from the English. Leiden, date of publication not known by us (Arrenberg, 1600-1787, p. 176). In English original (*Theodorus: a dialogue concerning the art of preaching*, by David Fordyce, to which is added a sermon on the eloquence, and an essay on the action, of the pulpit, by J. Fordyce): London 1755, Leicester 1815 (*Ten sermons doctrinal and practical, by a young curate; to which are prefixed, a Sermon on pulpit eloquence, and an Essay on the action proper to the pulpit*, by J. Fordyce). Cf. also his *The eloquence of the pulpit, an ordination sermon* [on Acts xviii. 24], Aberdeen 1752, Glasgow 1755.
- VAN LIER, HELPERUS RITZEMAR (1764-1793). P. *Opgave der beste middelen, om den gemeenen man het belang van den Godsdienst te doen gevoelen, en hem ter verkrijg- ing van rechtmatige begrippen omtrent dezelve bevorderlijk te zijn*. The Hague 1792.
- DE' LIGUORI, (Saint) ALFONSO MARIA, bp. of Santa Agata dei Goti (1696-1787). R.C. See Anon., *Het missiesysteem*, etc., and Dankel- man, Laurent, in 20th-century list, below.
- LOOSJES, ADRIAAN (1689-1767). P. *Uit de prediking; met een woord vooraf van V. Loosjes*. Haarlem 1905.
- VON MOSHEIM, JOHANN LORENZ (1694-1755). P. *Predikkunde en manier om de theologie te bestuderen*. Tr. from the German. Utrecht 1770 (in two parts). In German original (*Anweisungen erbaulich zu predigen*, ed. by Christian Ernst von Wind- heim): Erlangen 1763.
- RABAUT, PAUL (1718-1794). P. *De prediker der woestijn*. Tr. from the German by A. W. van Campen. Amsterdam 1861.
- In German original (*Der Prediger der Wüste, oder Treue bis den Tod*): Berlin 1860, 1867, 1878. Cf. *Trois séances sur Paul Rabaut et les protestants français au xviiiè siècle*, by Louis Philippe Benjamin Bridel (Lausanne 1859), and *Paul Rabaut, ses lettres à Antoine Court (1739-1755), dix-sept ans de la vie d'un apôtre du desert*, ed. by A. Picheral-Dardier, with a Preface by Charles Dardier (Paris 1884, 2 vols.).
- In English (*The pastor of the desert, sketches of Paul Rabaut, with portions of his writings*, tr. from the French of L. P. B. Bridel): Lon- don 1861.
- See de Zeeuw, P., in 20th-century list, below.
- REINBECK (REIMBEEK), JOHANNES GUS- TAV (1683-1741). P. *Regelen van verstandig en stichtelijk prediken*. Tr. from the German, with a Preface by C. C. van der Aa (q.v. above). Haarlem 1762.
- In German original (*Grundriss einer Lehrart, ordentlich und erbaulich zu predigen*): Berlin 1738, 1743.
- DE SALLENGRE, ALBERT HENDRIK (1694-1723). P. *Brief over de langwijligheid in het preeken*. Place not stated, ca. 1713 (Niceron 1, 125, *N. Nederlandsch Biogr. Woordenb.* 5. 649).
- In French (*Lettre sur la longueur des sermons*): places and dates of publication not known to us.
- Published several times, both in Dutch and in French.
- SCHMID, LEBRECHT CHRISTIAN GOTT- LOB (b. 1760). P. *Handleiding voor leeraars van de christelijke godsdienst, om verstandig en nuttig te prediken over de lijdensgeschie- denis van Jezus Christus*. Tr. from the Ger- man. Amsterdam 1802. Deventer 1851 (*Be- knopte handleiding bij de prediking over de lijdensgeschiedenis van Onzen Heer Jezus Christus*, tr. from the German by W. Goede). In German original (*Der Prediger der Pas- sionszeit, oder Auswahl guter und zweck- mässiger Passionspredigten, nebst vorausge- schickten Erinnerungen*): Leipzig 1797.

- SPALDING, JOHANN JOACHIM (1714-1804).
P. *De nuttigheit van het predikamt en der-
zelver bevordering ter meerdere onderzoeking
voorgesteld*. Tr. from the German. Leeuwar-
den 1776.
In German original (*Ueber die Nutzbarkeit
des Predigtamts und deren Beförderung*): Ber-
lin 1772 (Anon.), 1773, 1791.
VAN TOLL, ABRAHAM ARNOLD (d. 1764).

- P. *De uytnemendheid der oude boven jonge
predikanten*. Utrecht 1740.
VITRINGA, CAMPEGIUS, the elder (1659-
1722). P. *Over de leerwyze om eene predi-
katie wel op te stellen*. Tr. from the Latin.
Franeker, Harlingen 1724.
In Latin original (*Animadversiones ad meth-
odum homiliarum ecclesiasticarum rite in-
stituendarum*): Franeker 1721, Jena 1722, 1729.

NINETEENTH CENTURY

- ANDREAE, PAULUS JACOBUS (1803-1879).
P. *De evangelie-prediking in den geest van
den Apostel Paulus als maatstaf der beoordel-
ing van de tegenwoordige evangelie-prediking,
beschouwd in eene leerrede, gehouden ter geleg-
enheid van vervulde 25-jarige evangelie-pre-
diking den 16 Febr. 1851*. Zierikzee 1851.
ANONYMOUS. *De boetprediker te Utrecht: een
verhaal uit de veertiende eeuw*. Dordrecht,
Amsterdam 1856 (Brinkman, 1850-1862, p.
117).
ANONYMOUS. R.C. *Brief door eene Roomsch-
Katholieke broederschap uit Rotterdam gezon-
den aan den uitgever van 'De prediking der
paters Redemptoristen,' met een kort ant-
woord*. Amsterdam 1853 (Brinkman, *ibid.*,
p. 140). See Anon., *De prediking der paters
Redemptoristen*, below.
ANONYMOUS. *Gewijde rhetorica*. Amsterdam
1801, 2 vols. (Arrenberg, 1790-1831, p. 510).
ANONYMOUS. R.C. *Hoe er in de Roomsch
kerken gepredikt wordt: proeve van kansel-
welsprekendheid der paters Redemptoristen
in Noord-Brabant en Limburg*. Tiel 1852;
1853, 2 vols. (Brinkman, 1850-1862, p. 385).
ANONYMOUS. *Iets over eenige gebreken op
den predikstoel*. Tr. from the German. Gorin-
chem 1820 (Arrenberg, 1790-1831, p. 273).
German original not known to us.
ANONYMOUS. P. *De keuze van een predikant:
een bescheiden woord aan den algemeenen
kerkeraad der Nederlandsche Hervormde Ge-
meente te Groningen*. Groningen 1865 (Brink-
man, 1863-1875, p. 559).
ANONYMOUS. P. *De moderne predikanten
en het leeraarsambt; een woord van het hoofd-
bestuur der confessioneele vereeniging aan de
Hervormde gemeenten in Nederland*. Utrecht
1866 (Brinkman, *ibid.*, p. 820).
ANONYMOUS. R.C. *De prediking der paters
Redemptoristen, gedurende de dagen der te
Weesp gehouden missie van 22 Januarij tot
2 Februarij 1853, getoetst aan het Evangelie:
een ernstig woord aan Protestanten en*

- Roomsch Katholieken*. Amsterdam 1853
(Brinkman, 1850-1863, p. 672). See Anon.,
*Brief door eene Roomsch-Katholieke broeder-
schap*, above.
ANONYMOUS. *Vraagstukken bij de voorbereid-
ings- en belijdenis-predikatiën*. Groningen
1846 (Brinkman, 1833-1849, p. 735).
ANONYMOUS (SINCERUS). P. *De kansel-
ontluistering in de Nederlandsche Hervormde
Kerk tijdens de 17e en 18e eeuw, aangewezen
en gestaafd*. Amsterdam 1853 (Brinkman,
1850-1862, p. 770).
B[AKHUIZEN] V[AN] D[EN] B[RINK], LU-
DOLF WILLEM (b. 1862). P. 'Een hoofdstuk
uit de homiletiek.' Utrecht 1899 (in *Theol-
ogische studiën* 17. 50-65).
BALJON, JOHANNES MARINUS SIMON
(1861-1908). P. *Encyclopedie der christelijke
theologie*. Utrecht 1900.
BARTELS, J. B. *De inhoud en doeleinde van
christelijke leerredenen*. Haarlem 1802.
BENNINK JANSONNIUS, ROELOF (1817-
1872). P. *De eerste openbare prediking der
Hervormden . . . in 's Gravenhage, in Au-
gustus 1566, met geschiedkundigen aanteeken-
ingen*. 's Gravenhage 1866.
BERLAGE, H. P. P. *De verkondiging van het
woord Gods door de evangeliepredikers; Leer-
rede over Joh. xvii. 8a, uitgesproken den 9en
November 1862, ter bevestiging van B. J.
Adriani*. Amsterdam 1862.
BOERS, CAROLUS (1746-1814). P. *Handboek
voor jonge predikanten*. Leiden 1807.
BORGER, ELIAS ANNES (1784-1820). P. See
Tichler, Jacob, below.
BÖSKEN, J. H. P. *De waardij der evangelie-
prediking naar de behoefte des gewetens, ver-
plichtend voor de gemeente en den leeraar:
leerrede over 2 Kor. IV. 2b*. Vlissingen 1843.
BROUWER, HENDRIKUS (1823-1885). P.
*Evangelie en evangelieprediking: intrede te
Veendam*. Veendam 1857.
BUNGNER, LAURENCE LOUIS FÉLIX
(1814-1874). P. *Eene preek onder de regering*

- van Lodewijk XIV: bijdrage tot de geschiedenis en kritiek der kanselwelsprekendheid, in den vorm eener novelle. Tr. from the French. Zutphen 1844, Utrecht 1856 and Haarlem 1874 (tr. by W. G. Brill).
- In French original (*Un sermon sous Louis XIV . . .*): Paris and Geneva 1845, 1850 (3d ed.); Paris 1873 (6th ed.), 1882 (7th ed.).
- In English (*The preacher and the king, or Bourdaloue in the court of Louis XIV*, tr. from the French, with an Introduction by the Rev. George Potts): London 1853, Boston 1874 (*Bourdaloue and Louis XIV, or The preacher and the king*).
- In German (*König und Prediger*): Bern 1856.
- BURK, JOHANN CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH.** P. *Predikanten-spiegel: mededeelingen uit het ambtsleven van predikanten*. Tr. from the German by J. B. Keiser. Groningen 1855.
- In German original (*Evangelische Pastoral-Theologie in Beispielen*): Stuttgart 1838, 1839 (2 vols.).
- CARPENTER, WILLIAM BOYD**, bp. of Ripon (1841-1918). P. *Over preeken en predikanten*. Tr. from the English by M. L. Deenik, with a Preface by S. Cramer. Haarlem 1896.
- In English original (*Lectures on preaching delivered in the Divinity school, Cambridge, in April and May, 1894*): London 1895, New York 1895.
- CHANTEPIE DE LA SAUSSAYE, DANIEL** (1818-1874). P. See Meulenbelt, H. H., in 20th-century list, below.
- CLARISSE, JOHANNES** (1770-1846). P. *Voorlezingen over de uiterlijke kanselwelsprekendheid, volgens J. L. Ewald (q.v., below)*. Arnhem 1839 (revised ed.).
- VAN COOTH, A. M. C.**, and **LANS, M. J. A.** R.C. *Handleiding bij het onderwijs in de gewijde welsprekendheid*. Leiden 1896 (2d ed., revised and enlarged).
- COQUEREL, ATHANASE LAURENT CHARLES** (1795-1868). P. *Praktische beschouwingen over het preeken*. Amsterdam 1860, 1863 (tr. from the French).
- In French original (*Observations pratiques sur la prédication*): Paris 1860.
- In English (*The preacher's counsellor*): London 1867 (tr. by R. A. Bertram), New York 1867 ('Practical observations on preaching,' extract tr. by J. F. Hurst, in *Methodist quarterly review* 49. 485-499). See also Anon., 'Ex-tempore preaching,' London 1872 (in *London quarterly review* 37. 448-472).
- CRAMER, S. P.** See Carpenter, W. B., above.
- DEL PRAT, GUILLAUME HENRI MARIE** (1791-1871). P. *Verhandeling over de broederschap van G. Groote en over den invloed der fraterhuizen op den wetenschappelijken en godsdienstigen toestand voornamelijk van de Nederlanden, na de xiv eeuw*. Utrecht 1830.
- DOEDES, JACOBUS IZAAK** (1817-1897). P.
1. 1566-1866: *de Hagepreek herdacht na drie honderd jaren*. Utrecht 1866.
 2. *Wat zult gij preken? Toespraak aan studenten in de godgeleerdheid, bij het begin van de akademische lessen in de godgeleerdheid*. Utrecht 1866. See also van Maanen, L., below; and cf. Bronsveld, A. W., in 20th-century list, below.
- DOEDES, P. P.** *De eerste evangelieprediking (Luc. II. v: 15-20): leerrede, gehouden in de groote kerk te Zutphen op het 2en kerstdaag 1873*. Zutphen 1874.
- DOMELA NIEUWENHUIS, FERDINAND JACOBUS** (1808-1869). P.
1. *Geschiedkundig overzicht der predijkwijze in de Nederlandsche Luthersche kerk*. Utrecht 1845.
 2. *Abraham des Amorie van der Hoeven, beschouwd als een voorbeeld der kanselwelsprekendheid*. Amsterdam 1855. See van der Hoeven, Abraham des Amorie, below.
 3. *B. T. Lublink Weddik als prediker beschouwd*. Amsterdam 1864. See Weddik, B. T. L., below.
- Ecclesiastes. R.C.** *Oratorisch maandschrift voor Roomsche-Katholieke Geestelijken*. Zwolle 1875-1880 (ed. 1877-1880 by L. B. Mulder).
- EIGEMAN, JACOB** (1833-1902). P. *Na achttien eeuwen geen andere prediking! Leerrede over Joh. 1: 29b*. Delfshaven 1873.
- EWALD, JOHANN LUDWIG** (1747-1822). P. *Over de uiterlijke kanselwelsprekendheid*. Tr. from the German, with notes, by Johannes Clarisse (q.v., above). Zutphen 1814.
- In German original (*Brief über Declamation und Kanzelvortrag*): Heidelberg 1808.
- FRITSCH, JOHANN HEINRICH** (d. 1829). P. *Handboek voor leeraars om nuttig te prediken over de lijdensgeschiedenis van Jezus*. Tr. from the German by W. Goede. Groningen 1820.
- In German original (*Handbuch zur praktischen Behandlung der Leidensgeschichte Jesu*): Magdeburg 1814.
- GUNNING, JOHANNES HERMANNUS** (1802-1889). P. *Een woord over sommige vereischten der hedendaagsche prediking*. Dordrecht 1861 (Charles Kingsley: *Christelijke toespraken*,

voorafgegaan door een woord over sommige vereischten der hedendaagsche prediking, van J. H. Gunning, Jr.). See also Scheers, G. P., in 20th-century list, below.

HARTOG, JAN (1829-1904). P.

1. *Geschiedenis van de predikkunde en de evangelie-prediking in de Protestantsche Kerk van Nederland*. Amsterdam 1861, Utrecht 1887 (2d ed., revised and enlarged).
2. *De oranje-predikanten en hunne tegenstanders: eene bijdrage tot de kennis van den tijd der patriotten*. Rotterdam 1875 (reprinted from *Geloof en vrijheid*).

VAN HEYNINGEN, GEORG PHILIP KITS. See Kits van Heyningen, G. P., below.

HOEKSTRA, SYTZE (1820-1898). P. *Inhoud en doel der evangelieprediking, leerrede over Titus III: 8, 9, uitgesproken bij zijn eerste optreden als Hoogleeraar voor de Doopgezinde gemeente te Amsterdam, den 8 Februarij 1857*. Amsterdam 1857.

VAN DER HOEVEN, ABRAHAM DES AMORIE (1798-1855). P. *Johannes Chrysostomus beschouwd als een voorbeeld van ware kanselwelsprekendheid*. Delft 1825. See also Domela Nieuwenhuis, F. J., item No. 2, above.

VAN KAMPEN, NICOLAAS (1776-1839). *Verhandeling over de vraag: Welk is het kenmerkend onderscheid der welsprekendheid van den kansel, van den pleitzaal, van de raads-gadering en van de gehoorzaal?* Dordrecht 1835 (*Nieuwe Verhandelingen van de Maatschappij der letterkunde te Leiden*, Part 3).

KELL, [KARL] JULIUS (1813-1849). P. *De dorpspredikant*. Tr. from the German. Groningen 1847.
In German original (*Der Landpfarrer*): Leipzig 1845.

KITS VAN HEYNINGEN, GEORG PHILIP (1817-1903). P. *Christus prediking: afscheidsrede gehouden te Deventer, den 26 December 1884*. Deventer 1885.

KUYPER, ABRAHAM (1837-1920). P. *Encyclopaedie der heilige godgeleerdheid*. Amsterdam 1894.

In English (*Encyclopedia of sacred theology; its principles*): New York 1898 (tr. from the Dutch by J. H. de Vries, with an Introduction by B. B. Warfield).

KUYPER, HERMANN HUBER (b. 1864). P. *De opleiding tot den dienst des Woords bij de gereformeerden*. 's-Gravenhage 1891.

LANS, MICHAEL J. A., abbé (b. 1845). R.C. See van Cooth, A. M. C., above.

LAUTS, ULRICH HERMANN. *Ernst en boert: een ambtsspiegel voor geestelijken*. Tr. from the German. Leeuwarden 1825.

In German original (*Ernst und Scherz: ein Amtsspiegel für Prediger*): Bremen 1821.

LOEFF, A. P. *De eerste prediking voor de hervormden te Dordrecht, in de Augustijnenkerk na driehonderd jaar op dezelfde plaats herdacht: toespraak tot de Nederlandsche hervormde gemeente, gehouden den 21 Juli 1872*. Dordrecht 1872.

VAN MAANEN, L. P. *Aphorismen voor den evangeliedienaar op den kansel, in de catechisatiekamer en in zijn herdelijk werk, met een inleidend woord van J. I. Doedes (q.v. above)*. Rotterdam 1869.

MALCOMESIUS, H. P. *De prediking van het kruis: intree-rede uitgesproken te Franeker, op Zondag 26 Januarij 1868*. Leeuwarden 1868.

MANNING, HENRY EDWARD, card. (1808-1892). R.C. *Het eeuwigdurende priesterschap*. Tr. from the English by A. J. Dekkers. Haarlem 1909 (2d ed.).

In English original (*Eternal priesthood*): London, Baltimore, 1883.

In French (*Le sacerdoce éternel*). Bruges 1884, 1889, and Paris 1914 (tr. by abbé Charles Fiévet), Avignon 1891 (tr. by abbé C. Maillot). In German (*Das ewige Priesterthum*): Mainz 1884, 1891 (2d ed.), 1905 (3d ed.), authorized tr. by G. W. Schmitz.

In Italian (*L'eterno sacerdozio*): Rome 1884, 1901 (2d ed.), 1929 (3d ed.), tr. from the English by Benedetto Melata.

See especially chap. 14.

MATTER, JACQUES (1791-1864). P. *Het karakter der kanselwelsprekendheid*. Free adaptation from the French by W. B. J. van Eijk. Leeuwarden, Amsterdam 1856.

In French original (*Du vrai type de l'éloquence sacrée*): Paris 1854.

MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ, JEAN HENRI (1794-1872). P. *Twee leerredenen, over het kruis van Christus, en de prediking van het evangelie*. Tr. from the French. Amsterdam 1825. From his *Sermons laissés à mes auditeurs comme un souvenir de mon affection* (Hamburg 1813, 1823).

MOLSTER, J. A. D. P. See Vorhoeve, H. C., below.

MOSELMANS, BALDUINUS CORNELIS JACOBUS (b. 1830). P. *Een woord ter inleiding tot de lijdensprediking, gesproken te's Hertogenbosch, den 23 Februarij 1862*. 's Hertogenbosch 1862.

- MULDER, L. B. R.C. See *Ecclesiastes*, above.
- MÜLLER, JULIUS (1801-1878). P. *Iets over evangelie-prediking en predikambt*. Tr. from the German by H. V. Rombouts. Tiel 1851. In German original (*Der Beruf des evangelischen Predigers: Abschiedspredigt*): Göttingen 1835.
- NEBE, AUGUST (1826-1895). P. *Homiletische portretten: eene bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der predikkunde en der evangelieprediking*. Tr. from the German by F. van Gheel Gildemeester. Utrecht 1882. In German original (*Zur Geschichte der Predigt: Charakterbilder der bedeutendsten Kanzelredner*): Wiesbaden 1877 (3 vols.).
- NIUWENHUIS, F. J. DOMELA. See Domela Nieuwenhuis, F. J., above.
- VAN OOSTERZEE, JOHANNES JACOBUS (1817-1882). P.
1. *Jacques Saurin: eene bladzijde uit de geschiedenis der kanselwelsprekendheid*. Rotterdam 1855, Utrecht 1869. In French (*Jacques Saurin: une page de l'histoire de l'éloquence sacrée*): Brussels 1865 (tr. from the Dutch).
 2. *Praktische theologie: een handboek voor jeugdige godgeleerden*. Utrecht 1877-1878 (2 vols.), 1895, 1898. In English (*Practical theology, a manual for theological students*): London 1874 (tr. by M. J. Evans). In German (*Praktische Theologie, ein Handbuch für junge Theologen*): Heilbronn 1878-1879, 2 vols. (authorized German ed. by A. Matthiä and A. Petry). See also van Rhijn, Maarten, in 20th-century list, below.
- PHILPOT, JOSEPH CHARLES (1803-1869). P. *De evangelie-predikstoel*. Tr. from the English. Dordrecht 1862-1863, Kampen 1925. In English original (*The gospel pulpit*): Stamford 1857 (2d ed.).
- PLUYMAEKERS, ALBERT, R.C. *Het Heilig Hart op den kansel*. Roermond 1893.
- REINHARD, FRANZ VOLKMAR (1753-1812). P. *Iets over zijne leerredenen en zijne vorming tot prediker, in brieven aan eenen vriend*. Tr. from the German by G. J. F. Cramer van Baumgarten. Amsterdam 1813. In German original (*Geständnis, seine Predigten und seine Bildung zum Prediger betreffend, in Briefen an einen Freund*): Sulzbach 1810.
- RIENSTRA, BERNARDUS. P. *De Christus-prediking: godsdienstige viering eener 25-jarige evangelische bediening, den 27 April 1856; leerrede over Hand. viii: 56*. Dordrecht, Amsterdam 1856.
- VAN RONKEL, PHILIPPUS SAMUEL (1830-1890). P.
1. *Geloof en prediking: intrede naar aanleiding van 2 Cor. iv: 13, op 5 Mei te Haarlem gehouden*. Zutphen 1872.
 2. *De geloofsprediking en hare vruchten: afscheidstoespraak naar Psalm 116: 10, tot de Nederlandsche hervormde gemeente te Zutphen, gehouden 28 April 1872*. Sneek 1872.
- ROUSSEL NAPOLÉON (1805-1878). P. *Hoe men niet moet preken*. Tr. from the French. Dordrecht 1859. In French original (*Comment il ne faut pas prêcher*): Paris 1857. In English (*How not to preach*, tr. from the French): London 1858.
- VAN SENDEN, E. G. P. *De evangelieprediker, een gezant van Christus: leerrede bij de bevestiging en inwijding van W. C. van Senden tot predikant te Donkerbroek, Haule en Haulerwijk (28 Junij 1857)*. Breda 1857. Includes theory?
- SEPP, CHRISTIAAN (1820-1890). P. *Uit de predikantenleven van vroegere tijden: aantekeningen*. Leiden 1890.
- SMEETS, R. G. R. R.C. 'Kinderpreeken te Utrecht' (letter written in 1813). Utrecht 1912 (in *Archief voor de geschiedenis van het Aartsbisdom Utrecht* 38. 144-146).
- STÖCKHARDT, K. G. F. P. *Gedachten over christelijk leven, godgeleerdheid, predik- en herdersambt en vriendschap*. Tr. from the German? Groningen 1844.
- THEREMIN, FRANZ (1780-1846). P. *Demosthenes en Massillon, eene bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der welsprekendheid*. Tr. from the German by J. Schade. The Hague 1847. In German original (*Demosthenes und Massillon, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Beredsamkeit*): Berlin 1845. In English ('Demosthenes and Massillon—a contribution to the history of eloquence,' condensation and translation by J. B. Lyman): Andover 1849 (in *Bibliotheca sacra* 6. 1-26).
- TICHLER, JACOB (1804-1865). P. *Iets over Borger's kanselwelsprekendheid*. Amsterdam 1836. See Borger, E. A., above.
- VAN DER VEEN, P. P. *De taak des evangeliepredikers: intrede, uitgesproken in de Evangelische Lutherse Oude Kerk te Amsterdam, den 3en Juli 1892*. Leiden 1892.
- VAN VELZEN, SIMON (1809-1896). P. *De prediking met betrekking tot den tegenwoord-*

- igen tijd: rede bij het overdragen van het rectoraat [van de te Kampen opgerichte Theologische school], 19 December 1877. Kampen 1878.
- VINET, ALEXANDRE RODOLPHE (1797-1847). P. *Homiletiek, of theorie der prediking*. Tr. from the French, with notes, by E. Moll. Tiel 1854, 1875 (2nd ed., revised). In French original (*Homilétique, ou Théorie de la prédication*): Paris 1853, 1873. In English (*Homiletics, or the theory of preaching*, tr. from the French): Edinburgh 1853, 1858, New York 1854. In German (*Homiletik oder Theorie der Predigt*, tr. by J. Schmid, Preface by K. R. Hagenbach): Basel 1857. For further details, see 'French tractates on Preaching,' in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 36, 3 (October 1950). 318.
- DE VOOYS, CORNELIS GERARD NICOLAAS (b. 1873). *Middelnederlandse legenden en exempelen*. 's-Gravenhage 1900, Groningen and The Hague 1926, revised and enlarged ed. (*Bijdrage tot de kennis van de prozalitteratur en het volksgeloof der middeleeuwen*). Has connections with preaching.
- TWENTIETH CENTURY
- AALDERS, WILLEM JAN (b. 1870). P.
1. *Pascal als apologetisch prediker*. Assen 1941 (*Proefschrift ter verkrijging van den graad van doktor in den godgeleerdheid aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht*).
 2. *Preek en liturgie*. 's-Gravenhage 1947 (2d ed.). See *Bijbelsch-kerkelijk woordenboek*, below.
- Ambts-agenda voor predikanten*, ed. by B. Hage-naar and A. J. Wormgoor. Meppel 1948 (15th year).
- ANONYMOUS. 'De eerste vrouwelijke predikant: intrede van Mej. A. Zernike bij de Doopsgezinde gemeente te Boven-Knijpe.' Rotterdam 1911 (*Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 6 Nov.).
- ANONYMOUS. *Homiletisch memorandum*. Neerbosch 1932 (Brinkman, 1932, p. 341).
- ANONYMOUS. R.C. *Het missiesysteem van O. H. V. Alfonsus*. Amsterdam, without date of publication. See Dankelman, Laurent, below.
- ANONYMOUS. (B. v. d. B.). P. See van Rhijn, Maarten, below.
- AUSTIN, Dr. *De ketterpreek en het ketterproces*. Tr. from the English by H. B. Kennedy van Dam. Apeldoorn 1907. English original not known to us.
- VORHOEVE, HERMANUS CORNELIS (1818-1903). P.
1. *Het beeld van J. A. D. Molster, in leven predikant bij de Hervormde gemeente te Utrecht, geschetst als evangelie-prediker*. Utrecht 1850.
 2. *Homiletische gedachten: eene bijdrage tot de predikkunde, ter overweging aangeboden aan mijne jeugdige medebroeders in de evangelie-bediening*. Sneek 1883.
 3. *De prediker: eene praktische bijbelstudie*. Amsterdam 1891.
- WARE, HENRY (1794-1843). P. *Het improviseren, de beste preekmethode*. Amsterdam 1862, 1864 (tr. from the 3d American ed. by A. W. van Campen).
- In English original (*Hints on extemporaneous preaching*): Boston 1824, 1826, 1831 (3d ed.), London 1830, 1841 (in *Essays on the Christian ministry*, Preface by W. H. Murch), 1849, 1851 (with H. J. Ripley, *Sacred rhetoric*), Edinburgh 1836 (*Students' cabinet of useful tracts*, No. 4), Boston and London 1846.
- WEDDIK, BARTHOLOMAEUS THEODORUS LUBLINK (1801-1862). P. See Domela Nieuwenhuis, F. J., item No. 3, above.
- BARKEY WOLF, A. G. P. C. H. *Spurgeon en zijn boodschap aan ons*. 's-Gravenhage 1934.
- BENEDICT XV, Pope (1854-1922). R.C. *Encycliek over de prediking van het woord Gods*. Brussels 1917, Hilversum 1940, 1948 (tr. by F. A. J. van Nimwegen).
- In Latin original ('*Littera encyclica de praedicatione divini verbi: Humani generis redemptionem*'): Rome 1917 (in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis: Commentarium Officiale* ix. 305-317).
- In French (*Lettre encyclique 'Humani generis' sur la prédication de la parole divine: Texte authentique de la note pontificale aux chefs des peuples belligérants*): Brussels 1917.
- In Italian (*Lettera enciclica sulla predicazione della parola di Dio, e regolamento circa la s. predicazione*): Ravenna 1917.
- BERKELLBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, SIMON FREDERIK HENDRIK JAN (b. 1882). P.
1. *Over de verkondiging: rede uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het hoogleeraarsambt vanwege de Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht op 6 Mei 1935*. Utrecht 1935.
 2. *Koopmans, J.: Kleine postille; met een woord vooraf van S.F.H.J. Berkelbach van der Sprenkel*. Nijkerk 1938.

- BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, SIMON
FREDERIK HENDRIK JAN (b. 1882), and
ROSCAM ABBING, P. J., editors. *P. Hand-
boek voor de prediking*. Amsterdam 1948 (2
vols.).
- VAN BEUSEKOM, H. G. P. *D.L. Moody, de
groote Amerikaansche prediker*. The Hague
1937.
- Bijbelsch-kerkelijk woordenboek* (P.), ed. by
A. van Veldhuizen (q.v. below). Groningen,
The Hague 1919 (Parts 1 and 3 by W. J.
Aalders, q.v. above), 1920 (Parts 2 and 4 by
H. T. Obbink, q.v. below).
- BIJLSMA, ROELOF (b. 1880). P. See *Woord en
wereld*, below.
- BOON, W. G. P. See *De predikant en zijn ambt*,
below.
- VAN DEN BORN, E. THEODOOR. P. *De
wijsheid van den prediker*. Kampen 1939. See
also Schippers, R., below.
- BRILLENBURG WURTH, GERRIT. P. *Ver-
kondiging en zielzorg*. Kampen 1937.
- BRONSVELD, A. W. P. *Wat zult gij preken?
Toespraak bij de opening van zijne lessen*.
Utrecht 1906. For another work of the same
title, see Doedes, J. I., in 19th-century list,
above.
- BRUINING, A. P. 'Het Nieuw-Hegelianisme
en de evangelieprediking.' Haarlem 1905 (in
Teylers theologisch tijdschrift 3. 31-55).
- BUSKES, JOHANNES JACOBUS (b. 1899). P.
See *Woord en wereld*, below.
- CAEYMAEX, CHARLES. R.C.
1. 'Kanselredenaars.' Louvain 1909 (Extract from
La vie diocésaine, Part 3, Fascicle 5).
2. 'De missie prediker.' Antwerp 1910 (in *Vlaam-
sche kunstbode*, No. 3. 117-121).
3. 'Nederlandsche sermoneën.' *Ibid.* 1910 (in
Vlaamsche kunstbode, Nos. 7-8. 303-318; No.
9. 373-388).
4. *Nieuwe kansels in Nederland en België*. Lou-
vain 1914 (offprint from *La vie diocésaine*,
June).
See also Cajetan, P., below.
- CAJETANUS, P., C.P. R.C. *Praktische handleid-
ing bij het opstellen van preeken; met een
'Woord vooraf,' door kanunnik Dr. Ch. Caey-
maex* (q.v. above). professor van gewijde wel-
sprekendheid aan het Groot Seminarie te
Mechelen. Brussels [1913].
- CALLAËY, FRÉDÉGAND. R.C. 'Het Francis-
caansch apostolaat.' Antwerp 1927 (in *Francis-
caansch* 14. 173-192). Includes material on
preaching?
- CALLEWAERT, L. J. R.C. *De predikatie en
de hedendaagsche zielzorg*. Antwerp 1933
(*Zielzorg voor onzen tijd*, No. 3).
- CASIMIR, ROMMERT (b. 1877). P. See
De predikant en zijn ambt, below.
- Christelijke encyclopaedie voor het Nederland-
sche volk* (P.), ed. by F. W. Grosheide, J. H.
Landwehr, C. Lindeboom, and J. C. Rull-
mann. Kampen 1926-1929, 1931 (6 vols.).
- CRAMER, JAN ANTHONY (b. 1864). P.
'Preeken in nieuwen toonaard.' Leiden 1908
(in *Theologisch tijdschrift* 41. 514-537). See
also van Woerden, H. C., below.
- CREUTZBERG, H. W. P. *De preek in den
eeredienst*. 's-Gravenhage 1947 (3d ed.).
- DANKELMAN, LAURENT, C.S.S.R. (b. 1875).
R.C. *Het missiesysteem van O. H. V. Alfonsus*.
Amsterdam. Published anonymously and
without date (*Bibl. Réd.* 3. 280). For further
data regarding de' Liguori, see 'Italian treatises
on preaching,' in *Speech Monographs* 16,
2 (September 1949). 246, and 'French tractates
on preaching,' in *The Quarterly Journal of
Speech* 36, 3 (October 1950). 306.
- DEE, S. P. P. See *Kerk en maatschappij*, etc.,
below.
- DELLEMAN, TH. (b. 1898). P. See *Homiletica*,
below.
- VAN DIJK, DOUWE (b. 1887). P. *De preek-
trant van de dominé's in de kerken der af-
scheiding, in den jaren 1834-1869*. Aalten 1935.
First published in *Gereformeerd theologisch
tijdschrift* 35 (Aalten 1934). 451-480.
See also Schippers, R., below.
- VAN DIJK, F. GUILLAUME. P. See Schippers,
R., below.
- VAN DIJK, ISAAK. P. *De reputatie van onze
predikanten*. Baarn 1919.
- DUBOIS, A. P. *Van schaduwen en licht: herin-
neringen van een veldprediker; Inleiding van
J.M.J.W. Oustwoud Wijdenes*. Rotterdam
1940.
- ELDERING, PETRUS (b. 1868). P. *De predi-
kant als dienaar van de gemeente, de kerk en
het evangelie: rede gehouden op de algemeene
vergadering der Remonstrantsche Broeder-
schap*. Hillegom 1923.
- Encyclopaedie, Christelijke*, etc. See *Christelijke
encyclopaedie*, above.
- Encyclopaedie, Korte christelijke*. See *Korte
christelijke encyclopaedie*, below.
- Encyclopedie, De katholieke*. See *De katholieke
encyclopedie*, below.
- ENKLAAR, BERNARD PAULUS (b. 1883). P.
See *De predikant en zijn ambt*, below.

- ERINGA, J. P. P. *De roeping van de bedienaren des woords en van de gemeente: leerrede over 1 Cor. 4: 1 en 2, gehouden den 13den Maart 1904 in de Nieuwe kerk te Amsterdam bij de bevestiging van Ds. G. Mansvelt.* Amsterdam 1904.
- ERINGA, JACOBUS. P. See *Kerk en maatschappij*, etc., below.
- VAN ES, E. A. P. *Ambt en gebed.* Kampen 1940.
- ESSER, I. *Straatprediking, met een levensbericht van den schrijver door zijn oudsten zoon.* Baarn 1910 (5th ed.).
- EVENHUIS, R. B. P. See *Woord en wereld*, below.
- VAN EXEL, N. J. A. (1906-1944), and GERRITSEN, JOHAN. P. *Ons werk aan de Grebbe.* Amsterdam 1940.
- FARMER, HERBERT H. (b. 1892). P. *Dienaar des woords.* Tr. from the English by G. J. H. Gijmink. Nijkerk 1950.
In English original (*The servant of the word*): London, New York 1942.
- FERNHOUT, K. P. *De aanbeveling van den dienaar des woords bij de kerk van Christus: leerrede over Tim. 3 vs. 16 en 17; uitgesproken in de Keizersgrachtkerk op 26 Februarij 1913, ter aanvaarding van de bediening des woords in de gereformeerde kerk van Amsterdam.* Amsterdam 1913.
- FORSTER, D. A. P. 'De Bijbelse verkondiging en de Christelijke mystiek.' Assen 1949 (in *Vox theologica, interacademiaal theologisch tijdschrift*, December).
- GERRETSEN, J. H. P. See van Woerden, H. C., below.
- GERRITSEN, JOHAN. P. See van Exel, N. J. A., above.
- De gewijde rede: Praktisch maandschrift voor gewijde welsprekendheid.* R.C. Minderbroeders Klooster, Woerden (reported without indication of year or volume number in *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift* 92 [Linz 1939]: 349).
- DE GREEVE, H. R.C. See Janssen, S. V. D., below.
- VAN DE GRIENDT, ANTONIUS. R.C. *Hoe zal ik het hun zeggen?* Antwerp 1935 (*Opvoedkundige brochurenreeks*, No. 78).
- GROSHEIDE, FREDERIK WILLEM (b. 1881). P. See *Christelijke encyclopaedie*, above, and *Korte Christelijke encyclopaedie*, below.
- GRUYTIER (GRUYTER), J., s.j. R.C.; MOHRMANN, CHRISTINE; QUISPTEL, G.; WASZINK, JAN HENDRIK, et al. *Augustinus en de eloquentia.* Eindhoven 1948 (*Augustinus preken voor het volk: Monumenta christiana, Bibliotheek van christelijke klassieken*, ser. 1, vol. 1).
- HAGENAAR, B., and WORMGOOR, A. J., editors. See *Ambts-agenda voor predikanten*, above.
- HARDEMAN, Pater, s.j. R.C. *Franciscus Costerus (1532-1619), een Vlaamsche apostel en volksredenaar.* Alken 1933.
- HARRENSTEIN, WILLEM GERHARD (b. 1886). P. See Ringnalda, D., below.
- VAN HEYBEECK, BASILIUS, c.ss.R. (b. 1880). R.C.
1. 'Moderne missionering op het Katholiek Kongres van Mechelen.' Brussels 1936 (in *Pastor bonus* 16. 176-183).
2. 'De moderne volksmissie.' Brussels 1937 (in *Verhandelingen van het vie Katholiek Kongres van Mechelen; Pt. II: Godsdienstig leven en katholieke actie*, pp. 70-79).
- HILDEBRAND, P. R.C. 'Kapucijnerpredicatie in België vóór de Fransche Omwenteling.' Antwerp 1942 (in *Ons geestelijk erf* 16. 52-84, 236-264).
- HIJLKEMA, C. B. *Het predikambt in de toekomst.* Haarlem 1919.
- HOEKSTRA, TJEERD (b. 1880). P.
1. *De tegenwoordige critiek op onze preeken.* Kampen 1918.
2. *Gereformeerde prediking.* Baarn 1920. Wageningen 1926.
3. *Het woord Gods in de prediking: een beoordeeling van Barths woordtheologie.* Kampen 1913.
- Homiletica.* (P.), ed. by Th. Delleman, J. E. Uitman, D. K. Wielenga, and J. G. Woelderink. Aalten 1947 (7th year).
- HORNBORG, HARALD (b. 1890). *Prediker in de eenzaamheid: roman.* Tr. from the Swedish by N. Basenau-Goemans. Amsterdam 1939. In Swedish original (*Ödemarksprästen*): Stockholm 1938.
In English (*Passion and the sword*, tr. from the Swedish by Gösta Larsson): New York, London 1941.
- HORREÛS DE HAAS, GERARDUS (b. 1879). P. See *De predikant en zijn ambt*, below.
- HUIJSER, PH. J. P. "Exemplarische" prediking.' Heusden 1949 (in *Gereformeerd theologisch tijdschrift*, No. 4).
- HUISMANS, S. (In Frisian:) *Preekjen yn eigen taal; taspraak halden op 'e Friezendei to Snits 26 Juli 1916.* Sneek 1916.

- HULST, LAMMERT J. *Drie en zestig jaren prediker*. Kampen 1913.
- IMMINK-COST BUDDE, G. B. P. See *De predikant en zijn ambt*, below.
- JANSSEN, S. V. D. R.C. *Een bijdrage voor de methodiek van het homiletica-onderwijs op het Groot-seminarie* (with a Preface by H. de Greeve). Steyl-Tegelen 1946.
- JANSSENS, J., s.j. R.C. *Oostersche kerken en westersch apostolaat*. Louvain 1924.
- DE JONGE, Z. E. H. Kan. R.C. *Sint Joannes Chrysostomus, Over het priesterschap*, tr. from the Greek by Frans Vermuyten, with an Introduction by Z. E. H. Kan. De Jonge. Brussels 1922.
- JOOSTING, JAN GUALTERUS CHRISTIAAN (b. 1866). *Het ambt van predikant*. Assen 1904.
- JUTEN, F. G. P. See Schneider, H., below.
- KASSIEPE, MAX, O.M.I. R.C. *De volksmissiën in deze nieuwe tijden, en de Deutsche wijk-missiën* (the latter by Antoine Otten, C.S.S.R., tr. by A. Hens). Antwerp 1936. German original of the work by Antoine Otten not definitely known to us, but cf. his 'Ein neuzeitliches Missionswerk (Die erste Haus- und Kapellenmission in Deutschland)', Bonn 1925 (in *Der Volksmissionar* 4. 26-29, 59-62, 74-76), and his 'Die Haus- und Kapellenmissionen', communication to the Missions Conference at Hofheim-Taurus, Wiesbaden 1928 (in *Paulus* 5. 54).
- De katholieke encyclopedie* (R.C.), ed. by Jan Sassen. Amsterdam 1933-1939 (in 24 parts followed by a vol. containing Supplement and Index).
- VAN KATWIJK, D. J. P. See *Kerk en maatschappij*, etc., below.
- VON KEPPLER, PAUL WILHELM, bp. of Rottenburg in Württemberg (1852-1926). R.C. *Gedachten en raadgevingen voor den kansel*. Tr. from the German by F. M. Hack, O.C.I.S.T. Sint-Nicolaas (Waas), Breda 1913.
- In German original (*Homiletische Gedanken und Ratschläge*): Freiburg im Breisgau 1910 (first 6 eds.).
- In French (*La prédication contemporaine, pensées et conseils homilétiques*, tr. from the German by Léon Douadicq): Paris 1912.
- Kerk en maatschappij in verleden en heden: beknopt christelijk encyclopaedisch handboek* (P.), ed. by J. C. Rullmann and J. A. Nederbragt, with the collaboration of S. P. Dee, Jacobus Eringa, D. J. van Katwijk, A. B. W. M. Kok, D. Nauta, and Tj. van Wieren. Amsterdam 1934-1936 (3 vols.).
- KOK, A. B. W. M. P. See *Kerk en maatschappij*, etc., above.
- KOK, J. P. *De opleiding tot den dienst des woords 'voor de kerk door de kerk.'* Kampen 1906.
- Korte christelijke encyclopaedie* (P.), ed. by F. W. Grosheide. Kampen 1934.
- KÜHLER, WILHELMUS JOHANNES (b. 1874). P. 'Prediking van Geert Groote [1340-1384].' Haarlem 1907 (in *Teylers theologisch tijdschrift* 5. 51-87).
- KUIPER, J. H. (b. 1886). *Er gaat een dominee voorbij*. Zwolle 1949 (1st and 2d eds.).
- KUIPERS, R. H. P. See Schippers, R., below.
- LANDWEHR, J. H. P. See *Christelijke encyclopaedie*, above.
- VAN LEEUWEN, J. A. C. P. *Voorwerpelijke en orderwerpelijke prediking: referaat gehouden op het 13de jaarvergadering van den Gereformeerde bond*, 1918. Maasluis 1937 (2d ed.).
- LIEVE, H. L., and TER STEEGE, K. R. *Predikant achter prikkeldraad*. Nijkerk 1946.
- LINDEBOOM, A. M. *Ambt en opleiding: een bespreking van enkele zaken betreffende kerk, opleiding, wetenschap en theologie*. Goes 1940. Includes material on preaching?
- LINDEBOOM, C. P. *Is dat nu 'gereformeerde' prediking? Open brief aan den weleerwaard heer ds. G. H. Beekenkamp, Nederlandsch hervormde predikant te Delft, met aantekeningen*. Utrecht 1908. See also *Christelijke encyclopaedie*, above.
- LOOSJES, VINCENT (b. 1855). P. See Loosjes, A., in 18th-century list, above.
- VAN LUNZEN, H. P. See *De predikant en zijn ambt*, below.
- VAN DER MEIDEN, L. H. P. *Allegorische prediking: rede uitgesproken bij de overdracht van het rectoraat aan de theologische school der Christelijke gereformeerde kerk op 10 September 1946*. Dordrecht 1946.
- MEULENBELT, H. H. P. *De prediking van D. Chantepie de la Saussaye* (q.v. in 19th-century list, above). Nijmegen 1907.
- MOHRMANN, CHRISTINE (b. 1903). R.C. *Sint Augustinus: Preken voor het volk; Handelende over de Heilige Schrift en het eigen van den tijd*. Tr. with Introduction by Christine Mohrmann. Utrecht 1948. See also Gruytier, J., above.
- MULDERS, M. R.C. 'De prediking in de Oude Kerk.' Zwolle 1946 (in *Nederlandsche katholieke stemmen* 42. 195-200, 217-222).

- NAUTA, DOEDE (b. 1898). P. See *Kerk en maatschappij*, etc., above.
- NEDERBRAGT, JOHAN ALEXANDER (b. 1880). P. See *Kerk en maatschappij*, etc., above.
- NOORDELOOS, P. R.C. *De eerste geloofsverkondigers in West-Friesland*. Nijmegen 1940.
- NOORDMANS, OEPKE (b. 1871). P. 'Mystiek en prediking.' Assen 1949 (in *Vox theologica*, December).
- VAN NYS, THEODOOR. P. *De catechismus op de preekstoel*. Tongerlo 1947 (subtitle: *Euntes docete*), in two parts.
- OBBINK, HERMAN THEODORUS (b. 1869). P. See *Bijbelsch-kerkelijk woordenboek*, above.
- ODÉ, AREND WILLEM MAURITS (b. 1865). P. *De predikant en de politiek*. 's-Gravenhage 1938 (*Tijdseinen: Stemmen uit Christelijk-historischen kring*, No. 3).
- OOSTWOUD WIJDENES, J. M. J. W. P. See Dubois, A., above.
- OTTEN, ANTOINE, C.S.S.R. (b. 1893). R.C. See Kassiepe, Max, above.
- Predikant en dokter*. Zeist, vol. 1 (1930) —.
- De predikant en zijn ambt* (P.), by W. G. Boon, R. Casimir, B. P. Enklaar, G. Horreüs de Haas, G. B. Immink-Cost Budde, H. van Lunzen, L. M. Steenbergen, H. A. Vermeulen, A. J. Werner, and M. C. van Wijhe. Huis ter Heide 1928.
- QUISPTEL, G. R.C. See Gruytier, J., above.
- VAN RHIJN, MAARTEN (b. 1888). P. *Gemeenschap en vereenzaming: een studie over J. J. van Oosterzee*. Amsterdam 1940. Reviewed by C. W. Roldanus in *Tijdschrift voor geschiedenis* 57 (Groningen 1942). 74-75, and by B. v. d. B., in *Nederlandsch archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 33 (The Hague 1941). 71. See van Oosterzee, J. J., in 19th-century list, above.
- RIDDERBOS, JAN (b. 1879). P. *Profeet en prediker: toespraak gehouden den 19den December bij de viering van het 9e lustrum van het studentencorps "Fides quaerit intellectum" aan de theologische school te Kampen*. Kampen 1925.
- RINGNALDA, D. P. *Als een goed soldaat, 2 Timotheüs ii: 3; met een persoonlijk woord van W. G. Harrenstein*. 's-Gravenhage 1940.
- RITTER, PIERRE HENRI (b. 1882). P. 'Kanselwelsprekendheid.' Haarlem 1912 (in *Nieuw theologisch tijdschrift* 1. 1-18).
- De Roerganger (Vlootpredikant)*. (P.), ed. by J. H. Sillevius Smitt. 's-Gravenhage 1942 (1st year).
- ROLDANUS, CORNELIA WILHELMINA (b. 1889). P. See van Rhijn, Maarten, above.
- ROSCAM ABBING, P. J. P. See Berkelbach van der Sprenkel, S. F. H. J., above.
- RULLMANN, JOHAN COENRAAD (b. 1876). P. See *Christelijke encyclopaedie*, and *Kerk en maatschappij*, etc., above.
- RUTGERS, A. R. P. *Karakter en bezwaren van het predikantschap*. Amsterdam 1913.
- Sacerdos* (R.C.), tweemaandelijksch tijdschrift voor predicatie en zielzorg. Malines 1933 —
- SASSEN, JAN, editor. R.C. See *De Katholieke encyclopedie*, above.
- De Schatkamer: maandschrift voor den heiligen dienst*. P. Welsum bij Olst, Amsterdam, Terneuzen, vol. 1 (1907) —; Utrecht 1932, New ser., vol. 1 —.
- SCHEERS, GEORG PHILIPPUS. P. 'Gunnings prediking.' Wageningen 1948 (in *Nederlands theologisch tijdschrift* 3. 28-46). See Gunning, J. H., in 19th-century list, above.
- SCHIPPERS, R. P. *Van den dienst des woords: een boek over de prediking naar Gereformeerde belijdenis*, with contributions by R. Schippers, R. H. Kuipers, E. Theodoor van den Born (qq.v. above), H. J. Spier, M. B. van 't Veer (qq.v. below), F. Guillaume en D. van Dijk (qq.v. above). Goes 1944.
- SCHNEIDER, H., and JUTEN, F. G. P. 'Abraham Santvoort, graveur en predikant te Breda.' Bergen-op-Zoom 1929 (in *Taxandria* 36. 187-192). See [van] Santvoort, Abraham, in 17th-century list, above.
- DE SCHREVEL, A. C. 'Br. Cornelis Adriaensz van Dordrecht: zijn leven, zijn preeken.' Tilburg 1925 (in *Historisch tijdschrift* 4. 217-259). See Adriaensz, Cornelis, in 16th-century list, above.
- SCHULTE, JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, O.M.CAP. (b. 1880). R.C. *Modern apostolaat*. Tr. from the German by Michaël-Angelus. Antwerp 1934.
- In German original (*Pastorales und Aszetisches für Seelsorger unserer Tage*): Stuttgart 1927-1929 (2 vols.).
- SIKKEL, D. P. *Eeredienst, prediking, ambt*. Amsterdam 1937.
- SIKKEL, JOHANNES CORNELIS. P. *Dienst des woords*. Amsterdam 1936.
- SILLEVIS SMITT, J. H. P. See *De Roerganger*, above.
- SIZOO, ALEXANDER (b. 1889). P. *Eloquentia sacra: het stijlprobleem der oude christenen*. Delft 1939.

- VAN DER SLUIS, A. P. *De rechte prediking en hare waardeering: intreërede uitgesproken in de Groote Kerk te Dordrecht, den 1en September 1901.* Dordrecht 1901.
- SPIER, H. J. P. See Schippers, R., above.
- STAM, J. J. (b. 1891). P. *Rondom de preek.* Amsterdam 1946.
- TER STEEGE, K. R. See Lieve, H. L., above.
- STEENBERGEN, L. M. P. See *De predikant en zijn ambt*, above.
- STOKS, MARTIN, C.S.S.R. (b. 1881). R.C.
1. 'Praedicate evangelium.' Zwolle 1915 (in *Nederlandsche katholieke stemmen* 15. 3-13).
 2. 'De H. Petrus Canisius als prediker.' Utrecht 1925 (in *Studiën* 57 [2]. 399-422). See Petrus Canisius in 16th-century list, above.
- STRIJD, KR. P. 'Het probleem der prediking.' Assen 1949 (in *Vox theologica*, vol. 19). See also *Woord en wereld*, below.
- TESSER, CAROLUS. *Predica verbum.* Hilversum 1940.
- Theologie en praktijk: tijdschrift van den predikant.* P. Lochem 1946 (5th year).
- THIJSSSEN, F. *Het godsdienstige gesprek: de grondslagen en de praktijk.* Utrecht 1947.
- TOUW, H. C. P. *Verontrustende prediking.* Nijkerk 1938.
- UITMAN, J. E. P. See *Homiletica*, above.
- VAN 'T VEER, M. B. P. See Schippers, R., above.
- VAN VELDHUIZEN, ADRIANUS (1871-1937). P.
1. *Hoe maakt men zijn preek?* Wageningen 1930, 1933 (2d ed., revised).
 2. *Hoe te preeken in dezen tijd.* Ibid. 1935. See also *Bijbelsch-kerkelijk woordenboek*, above.
- VERMEULEN, H. A. P. See *De predikant en zijn ambt*, above.
- VRIEZEN, THEODOOR C. P. 'Prediker en de achtergrond van zijn wijsheid.' Leiden 1946 (in *Nederlandsch theologisch tijdschrift*, published by the Theological faculties of the State Universities at Leiden, Groningen, and Utrecht, and of the University of Amsterdam, vol. 1, No. 1).
- WALTERS, JOSEPH. R.C. *De eerste geloofs-predikers op het grondgebiet van het huidige bisdom Gent.* Ghent 1946.
- WASSINK, KLAUS. P. 'Bijbelcritiek en evangelieprediking.' Rotterdam 1907 (in *Geloof en vrijheid* 41. 386-413).
- WASZINK, JAN HENDRIK (b. 1908). R.C. See Gruytier, J., above.
- WERNER, A. J. P. See *De predikant en zijn ambt*, above.
- WIELENGA, DOUWE KLAAS (b. 1905). P. See *Homiletica*, above.
- VAN WIEREN, T. J. P. See *Kerk en maatschappij*, etc., above.
- VAN WIJHE, M. C. P. See *De predikant en zijn ambt*, above.
- VAN WIJK, P. P. *De prediker des evangelies, de dienaar der gemeente: leerrede ter gedachtenis aan vijf-en-twintigjarige evangeliebediening, gehouden den 14ten April 1901.* Amsterdam 1901.
- WINKLER, JOHAN (b. 1898). See *Woord en wereld*, below.
- WOELDERINK, J. G. P. See *Homiletica*, above.
- VAN WOERDEN, H. C. P. *Kansel en schrift-critiek: een woord tot de predikanten dr. theol. J. A. Cramer en dr. theol. J. H. Gerretsen (qq. v., above).* 's-Gravenhage 1907.
- Woord en wereld* (P.), ed. by R. Bijlsma, J. J. Buskes, R. B. Evenhuis, Kr. Strijd, and J. Winkler. 's-Gravenhage, vol. 1 (1949) —.
- WORMGOOR, A. J. See *Ambts-agenda voor predikanten*, above.
- DE ZEEUW, P. P. *De prediker der wildernis: het leven van Paul Rabaut (q.v. in 18th-century list, above).* Delft 1940.

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF THREE SPEECH VARIABLES ON LISTENER COMPREHENSION

K. C. BEIGHLEY

Stockton College

IS it true that a speaker needs to organize his materials and speak with vocally meaningful inflections in order to communicate clearly with an audience? To test this commonly accepted hypothesis, the writer attempted, in a previous experimental study,¹ to discover if audience comprehension is aided by the vocal skill of a speaker, by organization of material, and by mode of presentation, whether by members of the audience reading the speech silently to themselves or hearing it from a speaker.

The purposes of this follow-up study are: (1) to check the conclusions of the previous one by using a slightly different population, and (2) to investigate a hypothesis about the influence of organization, which conclusions of the earlier study suggested. The hypothesis is: audiences which hear disorganized materials make their own organization of them and, as a result of this process, may remember those ideas longer. To test this theory, delayed recall as well as immediate recall is measured in this experiment.

I. EXPERIMENTAL PLAN

A. *Materials.* This study uses the identical materials of the earlier experiment. The easy speech is I. Norman Smith's "Basic Principles of Canadian Foreign Policy," shortened to about the same length as Robert Oppenheimer's

"The Open Mind," the hard speech.² These speeches seem well paired for the purposes of this experiment, since they both deal with the same area, foreign policy, in relation to the same basic problem, peace and war in world affairs.

The Smith speech is termed "easy" in relation to the other on two bases. One is that the writer's analysis showed that the hard speech contained approximately a two-to-one ratio of abstract ideas to concrete facts, while the easy speech had the opposite balance. The other basis for determining difficulty is that the easy speech, rated by use of the Dale formula³ for determining difficulty of reading material, ranks at the 9th-10th grade reading-level, and the hard one at the 13th-15th grade reading-level.

To provide the variable of organization, it was necessary to have both an organized and a disorganized form for each of the speeches. It was determined that the original form would serve satisfactorily as the organized form. The disorganized form was prepared by controlled random arrangement of the paragraphs of the organized forms, using exactly the same words except for a slight rewording of transitional material at the beginnings of only two paragraphs in each of the two speeches.

To provide the variable of vocal skill, two sets of two male college students

¹ Beighley, K. C., "An Experimental Study of the Effect of Four Speech Variables on Listener Comprehension," *Speech Monographs*, XIX (1952), 249-258.

² I. Norman Smith, "Basic Principles of Canadian Foreign Policy," *Vital Speeches of the Day*, XV (1949), 504-508; Robert Oppenheimer, "The Open Mind," *Vital Speeches of the Day*, XV (1949), 304-306.

³ Edgar Dale and Jeanne S. Chall, "A Formula for Predicting Readability," *Educational Research Bull.*, XXVII (1948), 11-20 and 37-54.

were used; one set was highly trained and highly skilled in radio speaking; the other, untrained and unskilled. Each speaker recorded on tape both speeches in the organized and disorganized forms.

For measuring the effect of the three speech variables, the writer constructed a 30-item, multiple-choice test for each of the speeches. The description of the earlier experiment includes a detailed discussion of the preparation of the speeches for organization, the choice of speakers, and the construction of the tests.

B. Conditions. Four beginning speech classes in the College of Liberal Arts at The Ohio State University in May, 1952, were exposed to the experimental materials in their normal classrooms at their regular class hours. Each class heard one form of the hard speech a day or two after it had been exposed to one form of the easy speech. Each class completed the immediate-recall test during the same period it heard the speech. During one class period either fourteen or fifteen days later, each class repeated the same tests used for immediate recall for both speeches. Table I summarizes the plan.

The basis used for equating these groups was the centile score on the reading section of the Ohio State University Psychological Test. This is comparable with the basis for equating used in the earlier experiment, raw L scores on the American Council on Education Psychological Examination for College Freshmen.

If groups to be compared were not already equivalent in reading ability, sufficient cases were deleted from the top or bottom frequencies of the larger group to make them so. Equivalence of means was defined as a level of confidence greater than 40 per cent ($P > .40$), based upon use of the t formula, and only four of the groups compared had a level of confidence less than 50 per cent.⁴

Next came the comparison of comprehension scores made by the groups comparable in reading ability. Differences in the means of comprehension scores were considered statistically dependable at the 5% level of confidence ($P = .05$).

Since the earlier study found no differences attributable to sex, data were not segregated upon that basis in this experiment.

TABLE I
PLAN FOR CONTROL OF EXPERIMENTAL VARIABLES.

E A S Y				H A R D			
ORGANIZED		DISORGANIZED		ORGANIZED		DISORGANIZED	
Skill Spkr. A	Unskl. Spkr. C	Skill Spkr. B	Unskl. Spkr. D	Skill Spkr. B	Unskl. Spkr. D	Skill Spkr. A	Unskl. Spkr. C
Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 4	Class 3	Class 2	Class 1

II. TREATMENT OF DATA

In order to discover the effect of the three experimental variables upon the comprehension of the speeches, two steps were necessary: (1) to make certain that the groups to be compared were of approximately the same ability, and (2) to compare the mean scores those groups made on the comprehension tests.

III. RESULTS

A. Effect of Organization. When the comprehension test means of classes exposed to the organized speeches were compared with the means of those exposed to the disorganized speeches, the results in Table II were obtained.

⁴ Henry E. Garrett, *Statistics in Psychology and Education* (New York, 1953), 212-254.

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF MEAN COMPREHENSION SCORES OF GROUPS EXPOSED TO ORGANIZED-DISORGANIZED
MATERIAL UNDER DIFFERENT CONDITIONS

Variable	N	Immediate Recall			Delayed Recall		
		Mean	t	Proba- bility	Mean	t	Proba- bility
Organized	52	16.65			14.60		
Disorganized	52	15.75			13.65		
Difference		.90	1.05	>.10	.95	1.13	>.10
Easy organized	26	19.04			16.54		
Easy disorg.	31	17.23			14.55		
Difference		1.81	1.53	>.10	1.99	1.68	.10
Hard organized	29	13.90			12.38		
Hard disorg.	29	14.41			12.93		
Difference		-.51	.57	>.10	-.55	.61	>.10
Easy skill org.	13	20.00			17.38		
Easy skill dis.	13	19.15			16.54		
Difference		.85	.54	>.10	.84	.44	>.10
Easy unskl. org.	14	17.57			15.29		
Easy unskl. dis.	17	15.88			12.82		
Difference		1.69	1.00	>.10	2.47	1.69	>.10
Hard skill org.	16	15.06			13.00		
Hard skill dis.	13	15.69			13.49		
Difference		-.63	.53	>.10	-.49	.38	>.10
Hard unskl. org.	14	12.86			12.21		
Hard unskl. dis.	15	13.60			12.33		
Difference		-.74	.62	>.10	-.12	.09	>.10

Since none of the differences in these comparisons reaches the five per cent level of confidence, organization apparently shows no statistically dependable superiority over the kind of disorganization used, either for immediate or delayed recall.

Do the above data support the writer's hypothesis that audiences might remember ideas from a disorganized speech longer, as a result of having organized the material themselves as they listened? The answer is no, since none of the differences is statistically dependable, and since, anyway, there are no consistent trends. In four of the seven comparisons, the organized speech brought superior comprehension on both immediate and delayed recall, achieving even greater advantage in delayed recall for three of the four instances. In the three remaining comparisons, disorganized means were higher both for immediate and delayed recall, and for two of those three instances, the differences for delayed recall were less than for immediate

recall. It is thus evident that these data do not at all support the hypothesis.

B. *Effect of Vocal Skill.* When the means of classes who were exposed to the vocally skilled speakers were compared with the means of those who were exposed to the vocally unskilled speakers, the results in Table III appeared.

It is apparent from these comparisons that audiences always achieved more comprehension from the skilled speakers than from the unskilled. For immediate recall, only one of the differences is statistically undependable, although for delayed recall the advantage of hearing a skilled speaker seems to have so diminished that none of the comparisons reached the criterion ($P = .05$) of dependability set for these experimental conditions.

C. *Effect of Difficulty of Material.* When the means of classes who were exposed to the easy speech were compared with the means of those who were exposed to the hard speech, the results in Table IV were obtained.

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF MEAN COMPREHENSION SCORES OF GROUPS EXPOSED TO VOCALLY SKILLED-UNSKILLED SPEAKERS UNDER DIFFERENT CONDITIONS.

Variable	N	Immediate Recall			Delayed Recall		
		Mean	t	Probability	Mean	t	Probability
Skilled	52	17.27			14.92		
Unskilled	52	15.13			13.33		
Difference		2.14	2.55	.02-.01	1.59	1.92	.10-.05
Easy skilled	26	19.58			16.96		
Easy unskilled	29	16.93			14.59		
Difference		2.65	2.30	.05-.02	2.37	1.99	.10-.05
Hard skilled	27	15.52			13.63		
Hard unskilled	30	13.13			12.20		
Difference		2.39	2.81	<.01	1.43	1.55	>.10
Easy org. skl.	13	20.00			17.38		
Easy org. unskl.	12	17.00			15.25		
Difference		3.00	1.75	.10-.05	2.13	1.38	>.10
Easy dis. skl.	13	19.15			16.54		
Easy dis. unskl.	17	15.88			13.29		
Difference		3.27	2.11	.05-.02	3.25	1.73	.10-.05
Hard org. skl.	15	15.40			13.27		
Hard org. unskl.	14	12.86			12.21		
Difference		2.54	2.15	.05-.02	1.06	.76	>.10
Hard dis. skl.	13	15.69			13.49		
Hard dis. unskl.	15	13.47			12.13		
Difference		2.22	1.95	.10-.05	1.36	1.05	>.10

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF MEAN COMPREHENSION SCORES OF GROUPS EXPOSED TO EASY-HARD MATERIALS UNDER DIFFERENT CONDITIONS.

Variable	N	Immediate Recall			Delayed Recall		
		Mean	t	Probability	Mean	t	Probability
Easy	52	18.29			15.51		
Hard	52	14.12			12.73		
Difference		4.17	5.49	<.01	2.78	3.48	<.01
Easy skilled	26	19.58			16.96		
Hard skilled	26	15.50			13.54		
Difference		4.08	4.08	<.01	3.42	2.95	<.01
Easy unskilled	30	16.67			14.30		
Hard unskilled	30	13.13			12.20		
Difference		3.54	3.44	<.01	2.10	2.10	.05-.02
Easy organized	27	18.74			16.30		
Hard organized	30	14.03			12.63		
Difference		4.71	4.36	<.01	3.67	3.53	<.01
Easy disorg.	29	16.79			14.00		
Hard disorg.	29	14.41			12.93		
Difference		2.38	2.40	.02-.01	1.07	1.02	>.10
Easy skl. org.	13	20.00			17.38		
Hard skl. org.	15	15.40			13.27		
Difference		4.60	3.43	<.01	4.11	3.07	<.01
Easy unskl. org.	12	17.00			15.25		
Hard unskl. org.	14	12.86			12.21		
Difference		4.14	2.60	.02-.01	3.04	1.91	.10-.05
Easy skl. disorg.	12	18.67			15.75		
Hard skl. disorg.	12	15.67			14.08		
Difference		3.00	2.01	.10-.05	1.67	.90	>.10
Easy unskl. dis.	18	15.83			13.11		
Hard unskl. dis.	16	13.38			12.19		
Difference		2.45	1.94	.10-.05	.92	.74	>.10

The above data indicate what normally might be expected: by a difference statistically dependable in most cases, audiences comprehended more of the easy material than of the hard, both in immediate and delayed recall. For immediate recall there are only two instances where the difference is not statistically dependable, and they approach the standard set for this experiment. For delayed recall the number of instances where there is not satisfactory statistical dependability has risen to four, suggesting that a two-week lag for this kind of material may be about as long as one might expect skill of the speaker to exert its effect.

D. *Effect of Two-Week Passage of Time.* How effectively do audiences remember ideas from prose of this level of readability? When means for immediate recall were compared to those for delayed recall, the results in Table V were obtained.

As might have been expected, immediate-recall means were superior to delayed-recall means in each comparison. Where the groups compared were large, all differences were statistically dependable. In the eight medium-sized groups, five of the comparisons had statistically dependable differences, but in the small groups, there was only one statistically dependable difference between immediate and delayed-recall means. Since the differences between immediate and delayed-recall means are statistically dependable for the large groups, but not for the smaller ones, it is probable that the two-week delay was long enough to permit whatever trends there might be to become evident.

The primary reason for including delayed recall was for investigating the effect of organization. Not only were there no statistically dependable differences found in the area of organization, but there also were no evidences of trends

TABLE V
COMPARISON OF MEAN COMPREHENSION SCORES
FOR IMMEDIATE AND DELAYED RECALL.

Variable	N	MEAN			t	Probability
		Immed.	Delay	Diff.		
Organized	52	16.65	14.60	2.05	2.33	.05-.02
Disorganized	52	15.75	13.65	2.10	2.56	.02-.01
Skilled	52	17.27	14.92	2.35	2.80	<.01
Unskilled	52	15.13	13.33	1.80	2.17	.05-.02
Easy	52	18.29	15.52	2.77	3.15	<.01
Hard	52	14.12	12.73	1.39	2.14	.05-.02
Easy organized	27	18.74	16.30	2.44	2.07	.05-.02
Easy disorganized	31	17.23	14.55	2.68	2.25	.05-.02
Easy skilled	26	19.58	16.96	2.62	2.15	.05-.02
Easy unskilled	32	16.59	14.06	2.53	2.43	.02-.01
Hard organized	30	14.03	12.63	1.40	1.54	>.10
Hard disorganized	29	14.41	12.93	1.48	1.68	>.10
Hard skilled	29	15.34	13.37	1.97	2.24	.05-.02
Hard unskilled	30	13.13	12.20	.93	1.06	>.10
Easy org. skl.	13	20.00	17.38	2.62	1.79	.10-.05
Easy org. unskl.	14	17.57	15.29	2.28	1.29	>.10
Easy disorg. skl.	13	19.15	16.54	2.61	1.30	>.10
Easy disorg. unskl.	18	15.83	13.11	2.72	2.05	.05-.02
Hard org. skl.	16	15.06	13.00	2.06	1.72	.10-.05
Hard org. unskl.	14	12.86	12.21	.65	.47	>.10
Hard disorg. skl.	13	15.69	13.49	2.20	1.72	.10-.05
Hard disorg. unskl.	16	13.38	12.19	1.19	1.02	>.10

which a longer period of delay might be expected to show more clearly.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The first purpose of this study was to check the three main conclusions of the earlier study by employing a slightly different population. The earlier study utilized freshmen and sophomores in a beginning speech course in a California junior college, while this experiment used students in a beginning speech course of the College of Liberal Arts of The Ohio State University.

The first conclusion of the earlier study was that organization shows no statistically dependable superiority for comprehension over the kind of disorganization used. With that determination the conclusion of this study agrees completely. The second conclusion of the earlier study was that vocal skill of the speaker aids the audience to achieve higher comprehension-test scores, especially when the material is hard or disorganized. With that conclusion, the findings of this study agree in principle, although they do not show clearly and consistently the effect of the vocal skill of the speaker. The third conclusion of the earlier study was that in every instance audiences achieved higher comprehension-test scores from the easy material than from the hard by a statistically dependable difference. In this study

the finding is the same, except that in a few of the comparisons the differences of means are not statistically dependable.

The second purpose of the experiment was to investigate the hypothesis about the influence of organization which arose from the earlier experiment. The writer theorized that if it were true that an audience achieves about equal comprehension from the disorganized material because it works harder to make sense of the material, then that audience might possibly remember it better. For that reason, delayed recall of about two weeks was used, as well as immediate recall. The data of this study do *not* support the hypothesis, for delayed-recall means show no statistically dependable differences between the means of organized versus disorganized materials. Nor is there evidence of a trend to suggest that longer delayed recall might exhibit such a superiority.

The conclusions of these two experiments, along with those of Smith at Indiana,⁵ make it obvious that there is much unknown about the functioning of organization in both comprehension and persuasion. This area should be a most profitable one for future research.

⁵ Raymond G. Smith, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Speech Organization Upon Attitudes of College Students," *Speech Monographs*, XVIII (1951), 292-301.

A CASE STUDY IN DELIBERATIVE PERSUASION: JOHN MARSHALL'S CONGRESSIONAL SPEECH ON JONATHAN ROBBINS*

GALE L. RICHARDS
University of Washington

IN his speech on Jonathan Robbins in the House of Representatives on March 7, 1800,¹ John Marshall reached the crest of his pre-judicial oratorical career. From 1783 until his entry into the House in 1799, Marshall had been an orator of energy and effectiveness in the courts at Richmond and in the Virginia House of Delegates. He was an articulate defender of Federalist party principles in the Virginia legislature during a period of Republican ascendancy in Virginia politics, from 1790 to 1797.² He was one of the most frequent pleaders before the bar of the Virginia superior courts from 1783 to 1799.³ This rich rhetorical experience served to prepare him fully for the part he played in the Jonathan Robbins debate in the House of Representatives during February and March of 1800.

I. THE SPEAKER

John Marshall, at the age of forty-four, was elected to the House of Representatives from Virginia in 1799. He served through the first session of the Sixth Congress, then was appointed Secretary of State by President Adams, to fill the vacancy left by the dismissal of

Timothy Pickering.⁴ His position in the House was peculiarly important, since he was the acknowledged leader of the Federalist representatives from the southern states, a bloc comprising about one third of the majority in the House.⁵ He conducted himself with a singular independence of the party leaders in Congress, and was apparently not the "wheel-horse" variety of political leader.⁶

Marshall's dilatory attitude toward his duties in the House, when highlighted against his control over a sizable segment of the voting power of the majority party, seems contradictory unless we examine the manner in which he came to Congress. Marshall was persuaded to stand for office from his district by George Washington, partly to increase the strength of the Virginia Federalist ticket with his tremendous personal popularity, and partly to provide leadership for southern Federalists in Congress.⁷

In his campaign Marshall had expressed his distaste for the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1797,⁸ and had sup-

*Based upon Ph.D. dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1950, directed by A. Craig Baird and Orville A. Hitchcock.

¹ *Annals of Congress*, X, 596-618.

² *Journal, Virginia House of Delegates*, 1790-1797, passim.

³ Gale L. Richards, "Invention in John Marshall's Legal Speaking: 1782-1800," *Southern Speech Journal*, XIX (1953), 108-115.

⁴ John Marshall, *An Autobiographical Sketch*, ed. by John Stokes Adams (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1937), pp. 28-29.

⁵ T. Sedgwick to R. King, July 26, 1799; in Charles R. King, ed., *The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, 6 vols. (New York, 1896), III, 69.

⁶ T. Sedgwick to R. King, May 11, 1800; in King, *King*, III, 237.

⁷ J. Marshall to J. K. Paulding, April 4, 1835; *Marshall MSS.*, Library of Congress.

⁸ "I am not an advocate for the Alien and Sedition bills; had I been in Congress when they passed, I should, unless my judgment could have been changed, certainly have opposed them." "Answers to 'Freeholder,'" in *Alexandria Times and Virginia Advertiser*, October 11, 1798.

ported President Adams' peace policy.⁹ These political heresies, clear deviations from the northern Federalist point of view (or Alexander Hamilton's point of view, whichever you will), doubtless aided Marshall's election, since Jefferson's Virginia Resolutions of 1798 had caused a great popular stir in Virginia. They were, however, viewed with dismay by Federalists from the northern states.¹⁰

We see then that John Marshall came to Congress in 1799 at the personal instigation of the venerable ex-President and was predestined to become a guiding influence among the southern Federalists. Other Federalist leaders were amply forewarned by his campaign declarations, which gave sound reason for them to speculate upon his possible actions in Congress. But they respected his reputation and abilities and the weight of Washington's personal support; and having no alternative, looked forward with mixed hope and apprehension to his appearance in the House of Representatives in 1799. Subsequent events justified both feelings in full measure.

II. THE CONGRESSIONAL AUDIENCE

The audience that Marshall faced in 1800 was almost evenly divided, with the Federalists holding a slight majority. This majority was counterbalanced by a spirited discipline in the ranks of a confident Republican minority, in contrast to the erratic control Federalist leaders exercised over party members. The basic disunity which was to cause the party's downfall in 1801 was already clearly evidenced in the House. The disagreement of President Adams and Alexander Hamilton was sympto-

matic of a far deeper cleavage in the party organization.

The House of Representatives of the Sixth Congress was composed of one hundred five members.¹¹ Virginia supplied nineteen of these. In keeping with her superior size and population, Virginia's delegation contained five more members than the next largest delegation of fourteen members, from Massachusetts. The majority of the House was Federalist, but the margin was not wide, there being fifty-seven Federalists, as compared with forty-eight Republicans.¹² In the Virginia delegation the Federalists were in the minority, with only eight of nineteen representing the majority party.

The atmosphere in which business was carried on was understandably tense and nervous. The Federalists, who had now been in power through almost three terms of office, had been driven into a defensive position by popular clamor against the Alien and Sedition acts, the war policy of the administration, the fiscal policies of the federal government, and such aggravating minor issues as the Jonathan Robbins case and the infamous Disputed Elections bill. Jefferson and his followers had succeeded in creating the impression that the Federalist party was making a last-ditch endeavor to perpetuate in power an administration of which the people no longer approved. This accusation carried the sting of a certain amount of uncomfortable truth, as was indicated by this comment of Gouverneur Morris, an intimate of Hamilton:

Of course the Democrats and their Demagogues have just cause to complain of the manner in which money is raised and our Expenditure is so far from economical, that no applause is to be expected on that score. But

⁹ H. Lee to J. Adams, March 14, 1799; in John Adams, *Works*, ed. by C. F. Adams (Boston, 1906), VIII, 628.

¹⁰ See King, *King*, III, 69.

¹¹ This number was increased to 141 in 1803, as a result of the 1800 census. See D. S. Alexander, *History and Procedure of the House of Representatives* (Boston, 1916), pp. 411-413.

¹² Alexander, *History*, p. 413.

the thing which in my opinion has done most mischief to the federal Party is the Ground given by some of them to believe that they wish to establish a monarchy.¹³

In the face of firm opposition the Federalist majority was disturbed and ineffectively controlled. Before the session began the House Speaker, Theodore Sedgwick, had indicated his reluctance to enter upon the business of legislation, primarily because of this lack of discipline and the uncertainty of its results.¹⁴ The growing dissatisfaction of the conservative wing of the Federalist party with what they termed "half-measures" was the basic cause for the lack of coordination in Federalist ranks in the House. That there was not much closer coordination in other quarters within the party is indicated in a comment by Alexander Hamilton on the new government's plans for military expansion:

In our councils there is no fixed plan. Some are for preserving and invigorating the navy and destroying the army. Some among the friends of the government are for diminishing both on pecuniary considerations.¹⁵

More moderate Federalists, while they subscribed to the theory that government should be extended, were not in accord with recent Federalist measures because of their political inexpediency. These dissenters, under the leadership of John Marshall in the House, were in hearty accord with the fiscal policies of Hamilton. They feared and distrusted the French Republic and so approved the military program of the Federal government, except that they were disturbed by its uneconomical administration. But their constituency was of a different temper than that found in the north-

east, since most of these moderate Federalists came from the south and west. Marshall, for example, came fresh from a period of service in the Virginia legislature during which he had served as the leader of a Federalist minority in a period of constant criticism of the Federal national administration.¹⁶ This experience tempered his opinion on such matters as the Alien and Sedition acts and the Disputed Elections bill.

In light of all this, it is not difficult to visualize the disorganized state of the Federalist party in the House of Representatives in 1800 and to conceive why it was that an independent and forthright attitude such as that demonstrated by Marshall should have a profound effect on the decisions rendered by that body. The House of Representatives in 1800 was a fluid political aggregation, mercuric in disposition, whose responses shifted slightly but perceptibly with each issue being discussed before it. An uncertain majority, a militant minority, and a highly aggravated foreign and domestic situation made any effort to control its responses and to direct them rhetorically a difficult and sensitive task.

III. THE OCCASION

The speech on Jonathan Robbins concerned a bitterly disputed Federal case which developed from an international incident in the port of Charleston, South Carolina, and the subsequent trial in the district court of South Carolina of the man upon whom this incident centered. Briefly, a seaman named Thomas Nash and a group of his shipmates on the British warship *Hermione* had mutinied, murdered their officers, then had taken the ship to a Spanish port and sold it. Two years afterward Nash

¹³ G. Morris to R. King, June 4, 1800; in King, *King*, III, 252.

¹⁴ T. Sedgwick to R. King, July 26, 1799; King, *King*, 70-71.

¹⁵ A. Hamilton to R. King, January 5, 1800; in Henry C. Lodge, ed., *The Works of Alexander Hamilton* (New York, 1904), X, 340-342.

¹⁶ See in particular *Journal, Va. H. of D.*, 1795, for a virulent, running attack on Washington's administration by Republican members of the House of Delegates.

turned up in Charleston on an American schooner. At the request of the British consul Nash was turned over to the British authorities under the provisions of the twenty-seventh article of the Jay Treaty.¹⁷ Nash maintained he was Jonathan Robbins, an American seaman who had been impressed into British service.¹⁸ President Adams directed that he be delivered to the British consul in accordance with treaty provisions. Nash was subsequently tried by court-martial, sentenced, and hanged from the yardarm of a British man-of-war.

The Republicans sensed in this case a welcome opportunity to harass the administration. The consequent hue and cry over the delivery of a supposed American citizen to harsh British justice made excellent campaign fodder. Although little hope was entertained by the Republicans that they would succeed in the matter,¹⁹ an attempt was made shortly after the Sixth Congress convened to obtain House affirmation of a resolution censuring the President for his treatment of this case.²⁰

¹⁷ See Thomas Bee, *Reports of Cases Decided in the District Court of South Carolina and Cases Determined in other District Courts of the United States*, (Philadelphia, 1810), p. 266.

¹⁸ This fact, if proven, would have put an entirely different construction on the murdering of a British officer, which was the specific charge on which he had been indicted.

¹⁹ Jefferson indicated this intention in a letter to Thomas Mann Randolph, before the session opened on February 2, 1800. His remark leaves little doubt that he had not hoped to succeed in the matter:

"Robbins affair is perhaps to be inquired into [at the present session of Congress].

However, the majority against these things leaves no hope of success." Paul Leicester Ford, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 10 vols. (New York, 1896), VII, 423.

²⁰ "Resolved, That provision ought to be made by law, for carrying into effect the twenty-seventh article of the Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation, between the United States and the King of Great Britain.

"Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to lay before this House copies of the requisition for, and other papers relative to, the apprehension and delivering of Jonathan Robbins, under the twenty-seventh

The discussion in the House of these resolutions was frequently obscured by the interjection of all manner of indirect accusations on the one side and heated rejoinders on the other. The debate shifted from one minor issue to another in its day-by-day progress throughout the month or more it was intermittently before the House. Ultimately, however, certain definite points of controversy did emerge. These were: (1) did the President of the United States act properly in directing the court to deliver up Thomas Nash to the British consul? (2) did the Judge of the South Carolina district court act properly in delivering up Thomas Nash at the President's request? (3) was the twenty-seventh article of the Jay Treaty with England properly interpreted in the resolutions? (4) was Thomas Nash an American citizen? This last-named issue developed from the receipt of certain documents from the Secretary of State, including depositions on the matter of his citizenship from citizens of the town of which Robbins, née Nash, claimed to have been a resident.

It is important to note that this case had been a minor issue in the Congressional campaign which had just ended. If not dealt with in this session it would doubtless become an issue in the 1800 presidential campaign. Thus an important general issue in the treatment of this case was its relation to the reputation of the Federal administration headed by John Adams. A cloud of doubt concerning the integrity and ability of Adams' administration might aid materially in turning the election tide to Jefferson and his party. Every member of the House was keenly aware of this

article of the Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation, between the United States and the King of Great Britain, together with copies of the communications (if any) between either of the Executive Departments and the Judge of the District Court of South Carolina, on the subject." *Annals*, X, 511.

fact, and was therefore sensible of the political implication which accompanied the outcome of this debate.

Marshall recorded his growing distaste for the turn the debate was taking in a letter to his brother James on February 28, complaining that,

Every stratagem seems to be used to give to this business an undue impression. On the motion to send for the evidence from the records of South Carolina altho' it was stated & prov'd that this would amount to an abandonment of the enquiry during the present session & to an abandonment under circumstances which would impress the public mind with the opinion that we really believed Mr Livingston's resolutions maintainable; & that the record could furnish no satisfaction since it could not contain the parol testimony offered to the Judge & further that it could not be material to the President but only to the reputation of the Judge what the amount of the testimony was, yet the debate took a turn as if we were precipitating a decision without enquiry & without evidence.²¹

It had become obvious to Marshall and to his fellow Federalists that the Republicans would be pleased to hold the Robbins affair open through this and following sessions by the device of requesting additional evidence from the Charleston District court, so that it could be used as campaign material in the forthcoming presidential election. So it was that on Friday, March 7, when the House took up the case after a brief respite for other matters, Marshall, now thoroughly aroused, rose from his seat and delivered the address with which this paper is concerned.

IV. THE SPEECH

This speech was a masterful analysis and brief of the whole debate on Jonathan Robbins, condensed and closely organized.²² It anticipated the lucid

precision of Marshall's Supreme Court opinions. Typically, it was of that form of organization described as "logical,"²³ in that its structure stemmed from formally stated propositions which delineated certain attitudes toward the issue or issues in a given argument. Marshall was given to this structural pattern in other speech situations.²⁴

The purpose or thesis of the speech in such a pattern of arrangement can of course be stated as a point of view toward the subject of the speech. In this speech it was that the President had acted wisely and legally in the Robbins case. Marshall made this purpose quite clear in his introduction.²⁵

A. Statement of Issues

It would appear that Marshall accepted Aristotle's classical dictum that "... the only necessary parts of a speech are the Statement and the Argument . . .,"²⁶ for he is said to have excelled in the statement of a case.²⁷ This speech exemplified his ability to combine exposition with argument in such a way as to mark more clearly the listener's way to easy acceptance of his conclusions.

The first premise in the speech was developed in several stages. First, Marshall supported a statement by Bayard

and such stenographic reports of the debates as they could obtain. Since this speech is reported in quite complete detail, there is good reason to assume that an authentic copy of it was available to the editors. For further comments on these volumes, see Elizabeth Gregory McPherson, "Major Publications of Gales and Seaton," *QJS*, Vol. XXXI (1945), 430-436.

²³ Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, *Speech Criticism* (New York, 1948), p. 396.

²⁴ Thonssen and Baird, *Speech Criticism*, n. 44.

²⁵ "... in order to demonstrate, that the conduct of the Executive of the United States cannot justly be charged with the errors imputed to it by the resolutions." *Annals*, X, 597.

²⁶ W. Rhys Roberts, trans., *Aristotle's Rhetorica* (New York and London, 1924), Book III, c. 13.

²⁷ Joseph Story, in John F. Dillon, *John Marshall: Life, Character, and Judicial Services*, 3 vols. (Chicago, 1903), III, 376.

²¹ J. Marshall to James M. Marshall, February 28, 1800; *Marshall MSS*.

²² Volume X, *Annals of Congress*, from which the text of this speech was obtained, was not actually published until 1851. The editors, Gales and Seaton, compiled its contents from files of newspapers, the journals of Congress,

that the laws of a nation should follow its citizens wherever they might be and apply to them regardless of location at the time of violation of those laws. After commenting upon the fact that this principle was generally recognized, he quoted as authority a work on international law by Rutherford, reading the passage which explicitly repeated this view.²⁸ This point he then extended by remarking that it applied particularly to fleets of a nation on the high seas, again supporting his assertion with a legal authority.²⁹

The second premise was developed in a series of carefully reasoned arguments controverting all the assertions of the Republicans to the effect that the United States had jurisdiction in this case, and contending that Great Britain, on the contrary, had sole authority over Nash and his companions.³⁰

In dealing with the second proposition, e.g., that this was a case for executive and not judicial decision, Marshall brought to bear on the subject his comprehensive understanding of the Federal Constitution and of foreign relations and international law.³¹ He resolved the confused mass of assertions made by the members in previous floor debates on this portion of the argument into two groups, to be dealt with from two minor premises stemming from this second proposition. These minor premises

were: (1) that no nation has any jurisdiction at sea except over its own citizens or vessels, or over an offense against itself;³² and (2) the right of every nation to punish is limited to offenses against itself.³³

The painstaking definitions of such terms as "piracy,"³⁴ important in the discussion of the issues of the case, exhibit to advantage Marshall's skill in exposition. The nicety with which he created definitive bases for argument is nowhere better demonstrated than in Marshall's subtle modification of this term to prove that Robbins was a mutineer, but not a pirate, as several Republicans had contended.³⁵ He hit directly upon the core of the issue of piracy by distinguishing "general piracy" from "piracy by statute," and by pointing out that his colleagues had been treating them as synonymous.³⁶

The second proposition Marshall developed through a series of refutational contentions, each of which re-analyzed an argument or re-defined a particular principle in international law. In the process of so doing he ran the complete gamut of refutational methods. He hinged the proof of this whole proposition on a distinction between "judicial power" and "political power," delineating the function of the courts and of

²⁸ *Annals*, X, 599.

²⁹ *Annals*, X, 599-600.

³⁰ "A pirate, under the law of nations, is an enemy of the human race. Being the enemy of all, he is liable to be punished by all. Any act which denotes this universal hostility, is an act of piracy." *Annals*, X, 600.

³¹ "It is true that the offence may be completed by a single act; but it depends on the nature of that act. If it be such as manifests generally hostility against the world—an intention to rob generally, then it is piracy; but if it be merely a mutiny and murder in a vessel, for the purpose of delivering it up to the enemy, it seems to be an offence against a single nation and not to be piracy." *Annals*, X, 602.

³² "It is by confounding general piracy with piracy by statute, that indistinct ideas have been produced, respecting the power to punish offences committed on the high seas." *Annals*, X, 600.

²⁸ Thomas Rutherford, *Institutes of Natural Law; the subject of a course of lectures on Grotius de Jure Belli et Pacis*, 2nd ed., (Cambridge, England, 1779). Marshall might also have been referring either to the earlier Cambridge edition (1754-1756), or to the first American edition, the exact date of which is not known.

²⁹ *Annals*, X, 597-598.

³⁰ *Annals*, X, 599-605.

³¹ Marshall's experiences with the "XYZ" mission in 1797, and his later brief experience as Secretary of State in Adams's cabinet, served to sharpen an already well-developed interest in international law, which was then but a budding branch of the ancient profession of the law. On the Supreme Court bench, he rapidly became known as an expert in this phase of the law. See *Autobiographical Sketch*, p. 18.

the executive department in relation to each branch of the government.³⁷

This case, Marshall claimed, was a political one, since it dealt with an agreement between nations, and not between citizens of one nation. This idea he pursued by establishing that the court had no jurisdiction over this case. He even caught up Livingston on an error in restating the appropriate article of the Constitution which delineates the duties of the Federal courts. Marshall, in thus clarifying the whole debate, succeeded in creating a tightly-woven case in defense of presidential action in delivering Robbins to the British authorities.

An interesting example of the way in which the orator used exposition in argument was his manner of dealing with the opposition's contention that, since points of law occurred in the case, it was not one for executive decision. Having already established this as a case in which the exercise of "political power" was required, he shrugged this argument aside by pointing out that ". . . a variety of legal questions must present themselves in the performance of every part of executive duty, but these questions are not therefore to be decided in court. . . ."³⁸ He contended that Albert Gallatin, who proposed this argument, had been misled by Livingston's misinterpretation of the Constitution in his original speech on the resolutions into an argument based on a false premise. He insisted that this presumption that the occurrence of points of law would, *ipso facto*, render the case improper for presidential de-

cision was not warranted, because these questions were of political law.³⁹

Marshall's definition of the function of the President of the United States in foreign relations was another masterful bit of exposition.⁴⁰ The relationship of the president to the execution of a treaty established in this description laid the groundwork for the third proposition, that the president had not interfered with the decision of the court, but had been carrying out his proper function.

In the development of this proposition Marshall defined the duty of the court in a criminal case in almost a rebuking fashion. The opposition had supposedly been defending the judicial rights of the district courts in certain of their arguments. Marshall's reply was a careful definition of the function of the court in somber words.⁴¹ His grave comment on judicial responsibility was accompanied by a delineation of the question of jurisdiction which left room for little doubt that the orator felt that presidential decision could be made in this case.

The concluding passage was a moving defense of the president in which, again, a definition of the court's function in this case was set forth. Utilizing his definition of piracy as distinguished from murder, Marshall pointed out that if Nash had been an American the crime

³⁹ "By what authority can any court render such a judgment? What power does a court possess to seize any individual and determine that he shall be adjudged by a foreign tribunal? Surely our courts possess no such power, yet they must possess it, if this article of the treaty is to be executed by the courts." *Annals*, X, 607.

⁴⁰ *Annals*, X, 613-614.

⁴¹ "They [the opposition] have treated the subject as if it were the privilege of courts to condemn to death the guilty wretch arraigned at their bar, and that to intercept the judgment was to violate the privilege. It is not the privilege, it is the sad duty of courts to administer criminal judgment. It is a duty to be performed at the demand of the nation, and with which the nation has a right to dispense." *Annals*, X, 615.

³⁷ "By extending the judicial power to all cases in law and equity, the constitution has never been understood to confer on that department any political power whatever. To come within this description, a question must assume a legal form for forensic litigation and judicial decision." *Annals*, X, 606.

³⁸ *Annals*, X, 612.

would have been something other than murder, and that the president had left it to the court to decide whether it was murder or not.⁴² If it was not murder, Marshall submitted, then the court could not, under the president's directive, deliver him up.⁴³

It is apparent from this brief appraisal that Marshall's statement of issues was a major element in the effectiveness of his argument in this address. He utilized exposition and analysis with ease and vigor in defining the bases for argument. The lucidity with which his case was stated enhanced considerably the persuasive impact of Marshall's address on Jonathan Robbins.

B. *Argument and Evidence*

This speech epitomizes and richly illustrates the best of Marshall's method of developing and supporting arguments. The supporting material used in the Jonathan Robbins address was primarily logical, usually deductive in form. These deductive patterns were chains of reasoning, employing contentions already proven as elements in a given deduction, a pattern of proof characteristic also of his courtroom speech.⁴⁴ This close interrelating of the argumentative premise and its support was enhanced, as we have pointed out above, by precise statement of the issues underlying the argument. This increased the apparent probability in a particular line of argument and focused

attention directly upon the conclusions the speaker wished his listeners to reach.

The limitation of chains of argument is the dependence upon the validity of the original premise. Marshall, always the careful logician, saw to it that no cause for cavil would be created by a careless or incautious phrasing of the basic generalization from which his deductive patterns of reasoning were developed.

Although he introduced direct factual evidence, established causal relationships, and cited examples with frequency when he developed an idea which had not already been introduced into the debate before he arose, the governing element of argumentative development in this speech was refutation of what had already been said. Marshall concentrated mainly upon the idea which had been introduced into the debate by other speakers and upon a close inspection of the logical integrity of their treatment of those ideas. There was some stronger hint of appeals to feeling and of dependence upon his listeners' respect for him personally at certain points in the speech, but these were muted.⁴⁵ This apparently imposed some restraint on the response of the audience to his speech, and appeared to give it an "intellectualistic" flavor. But what better occasion could an orator discover for encouraging restraint in his listeners?

This speech occurred at the end of a long and acrimonious debate over a highly partisan issue, and Marshall's dispassionate disposal of the issues in it was doubtless a real factor in his persuasiveness on this occasion. The cooling effect of his lucid, relatively unemotional development of the Federalist point of view on the Robbins case

⁴² "Thomas Nash was only to have been delivered up to justice on such evidence as, had the fact been committed within the United States, would have been sufficient to have induced his commitment and trial for murder." *Annals*, X, 617.

⁴³ "The act of impressing an American is an act of lawless violence. The confinement on board a vessel, is a continuation of that violence, and an additional outrage. Death committed within the United States, in resisting such violence, would not have been murder, and the person giving the wound could not have been treated as a murderer." *Annals*, X, 617.

⁴⁴ See Richards, "Marshall's Legal Speaking," p. 112.

⁴⁵ Richards, "Marshall's Legal Speaking," p. 114.

could allow tempers to subside and reason to prevail. He became warm in his advocacy only when speaking of the office of the President and of justice in general, thus infusing feeling into generalized attitudes which all could assume without partisan discrimination.

Marshall did on this occasion show slight evidences of an inclination which can be marked in all his public utterance, to accept as true the principle which he believed to be true, and to ignore blandly the necessity for proving certain of the contentions stemming from the application of those principles. He was inclined to take the same attitude toward evidence which was unacceptable to his argument. He exhibited extraordinary care, however, to avoid this inclination in the Robbins address, although the issues surrounding the confusion of dates on the President's affidavits hinted of it.⁴⁶ Despite this minor limitation, the proof of the arguments in this speech was handled in a careful, thorough, and highly persuasive manner.

C. Refutation

John Marshall employed all the common methods of refutation in the Jonathan Robbins address, concentrating upon the challenging of evidence, hasty generalization, faulty deduction, the adoption of opposing evidence, the exposition of inconsistency in argument and of irrelevant arguments, and *reductio ad absurdum*. The challenging of evidence and the testing of authorities occurred frequently. In the treatment of the piracy issue, for example, Marshall felt compelled to set Nicholas right, in a quiet and courteous fashion, in his interpretation of several authorities which Nicholas had contended were proof that murder was an act of piracy

under the law of nations.⁴⁷ Another instance of the speaker's effort to throw a different light on evidence was his section-by-section analysis of the United States statute introduced as proof that the Robbins case could be tried in this country.⁴⁸

The fallacy of hasty generalization was also brought sharply to the attention of the House with some frequency in this speech. An excellent example of this device occurred in the section dealing with jurisdiction, when Marshall refuted the contention that the indictment presented by the court established its jurisdiction.⁴⁹

Another general method of refutation which Marshall used frequently was the challenging of faulty deductive application of a principle to a particular instance. In dealing with the argument that the section of the Constitution which enabled Congress to define and to punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations, Marshall attempted to prove an inaccurate application of the principle of this article.⁵⁰

Of the special methods of refutation, Marshall most frequently adopted opposing evidence, exposed inconsistencies in argument, exposed irrelevant argument, and, surprisingly, utilized *reductio ad absurdum*. This latter form he had used but sparingly on other occasions. Its frequent occurrence here can only be explained by hypothesizing that Marshall was unduly nettled by the wasting

⁴⁷ "The amount of these cases is, that no new offence is made piracy by the statutes; but that a different tribunal is created for their trial, which is guided by a different rule from that which governed previous to those statutes." *Annals*, X, 600-601.

⁴⁸ *Annals*, X, 603-604.

⁴⁹ "It would be assuming a very extraordinary principle indeed to say that words inserted in an indictment for the express purpose of assuming the jurisdiction of a court, should be admitted to prove that jurisdiction." *Annals*, X, 605.

⁵⁰ *Annals*, X, 607.

⁴⁶ *Annals*, X, 616-617.

of time in the House on this purely political issue, and by his tender feelings toward President Adams, for whom he had a high personal regard.⁵¹

He obviously relished the discovery that evidence presented as proof by opposing speakers fitted neatly into the pattern of his own argument. This form of refutation occurred more frequently than any other in this speech and accounts for much of the strong impression this address made on the audience. Examples of the adopting of opposing evidence appear in connection with every major contention made by the speaker.⁵²

Marshall's method of argument, strongly marked by clarity of analysis and exposition, would necessarily lend itself to the exposition of inconsistencies in argument. The high incidence of such refutative usage in this speech is therefore not surprising.⁵³

A favorite device with Marshall was the statement of a contention in such a manner as to make certain opposing arguments appear irrelevant. Sometimes he ignored arguments altogether, evidently under the assumption that they would be considered irrelevant in light of his analysis.⁵⁴ In this particular speech, he appeared to take unusual care to recognize any argument which might have some influence on the outcome of the voting on the Livingston resolutions.

Thus he frequently reminded the audience that certain arguments were either relevant or irrelevant to the progress of the debate.⁵⁵

The curt manner in which Marshall treated several of the contentions, reducing them to absurd caricatures of argument, attests the feeling with which he entered upon his argument, and is the only clear evidence of emotion to be found in this address. Ordinarily his humor was of a detached, impersonal variety, but in this speech he seemed to take pleasure in treating opposing contentions in such fashion as to hold them up to ridicule.⁵⁶

Thus it is clear that Marshall availed himself of the whole gamut of refutational devices at his disposal to make abundantly clear the inherent weakness of opposing arguments. The weight of truth appeared to be on his side of the debate and he wasted no opportunity to bring its full force to bear upon the opposition by the use of appropriate rhetorical techniques.

⁵⁵ An interesting example of this method appears in connection with Marshall's argument against the jurisdiction of the court:

"... This article of the [consular] convention does not, like the 27th article of the treaty with Britain, stipulate a national act, to be performed on the demand of a nation; it only authorizes a foreign minister to cause an act to be done, and prescribes the course he is to pursue. The contract itself is, that the act shall be performed by the agency of the foreign consul, through the medium of the courts; but this affords no evidence that a contract of a very different nature is to be performed in the same manner." *Annals*, X, 608.

⁵⁶ "... can it be supposed that the act designed to punish an Englishman or a Frenchman, who, residing in his own country, should have knowledge of treasons against the United States, and should not cross the Atlantic to reveal them?" *Annals*, X, 603.

"... certainly this clause in the constitution of the United States cannot be thought obligatory on, and for the benefit of the whole world. It is not designed to secure the rights of the people of Europe and Asia, or to direct a control proceedings against criminals throughout the universe." *Annals*, X, 611.

⁵¹ It was Adams, of course, who had appointed Marshall to the famous "XYZ" commission in 1797. See *Autobiographical Sketch*, p. 21.

⁵² See in particular *Annals*, X, 600, 602, 603, 605, 608.

⁵³ The following is typical of this usage in this speech:

"... If there be this common jurisdiction at sea, why not punish desertion from one belligerent enemy, or any other crime which may be perpetrated? A common jurisdiction over all would involve the power of punishing the offences which have been stated. Yet, all gentlemen will disclaim this power. It follows, then, that no such common jurisdiction exists." *Annals*, X, 599.

⁵⁴ *Annals*, X, n. 46.

D. Delivery

An important factor in the persuasiveness of any speaker is his delivery. The impression made by his dress and manner, his voice, his physical behavior, and his apparent attitude toward his listeners and the occasion of the speech are necessarily a part of the appraisal of his speaking. To the extent that the effectiveness of a speech is a function of the speaker's delivery, it is essential to essay a picture of the speaker in action.

Marshall's physical appearance, while undoubtedly commanding, was certainly not elegant or graceful. He was described by one observer to be,

"... tall, meager, emaciated; his muscles relaxed, and his joints so loosely connected, as not only to disqualify him, apparently, for any vigorous exertion, but to destroy everything like elegance in his air and movements.⁵⁷

His dress and personal demeanor apparently were in keeping with his ungainly appearance. His sister-in-law, who was his lifelong friend and admirer, reported that,

... his total negligence of person often produced a blush on her [his wife's] cheek.⁵⁸

His manners, in his early years particularly, were not elegant or polished, but were rather more rough and hearty than those exhibited by the debonair gentlemen of the Tidewater, and of Richmond society. Grigsby informs us that,

... His manners, like those of Monroe, were in strange contrast with those of Edmund Randolph or of Grayson, and had been formed in the tutelage of the camp.⁵⁹

Grigsby's description, however, was of the young Marshall in the Virginia Ratifying Convention of 1788. It is apparent from the following description

of him by Thomas Hart Benton, famous senator from Missouri, that Marshall's intimate contact with Tidewater society through the subsequent decade must certainly have added polish to his manners:

Seen by a stranger come into a room, and he would be taken for a modest country gentleman, without claim to attention. Spoken to and closely observed, he would be seen to be a gentleman of finished breeding, of winning and prepossessing talk, and just as much mind as the occasion required him to show. . . .⁶⁰

His voice was apparently adequate for purposes of being heard, but was not altogether pleasant in quality. Wirt described it as "dry and hard."⁶¹ In describing his occasional lapses into a broader emotional strain and the effect of heightened feeling upon his delivery, Grigsby implies that his voice was not of extraordinary beauty when he notes that,

... the tones of his voice, exalted above his habit, were in plaintive unison with his action. . . .⁶²

His loose-limbed structure evidently made his movement appear awkward at times. His gestures seemed to be neither varied nor graceful, consisting mainly of a vigorous perpendicular swing of his right arm from the level of his head to his waist.⁶³

This seemingly unprepossessing delivery was colored considerably, if not tempered completely, by Marshall's warm and friendly personality, which radiated geniality and humor. Listeners were drawn to Marshall readily, despite the fact that his convictions upon most matters were unusually firm. His personality evoked responsive friendliness even where opinion differed from his own.

⁵⁷ William Wirt, *The Letters of the British Spy* (Philadelphia, 1837), p. 178.

⁵⁸ Mrs. E. Carrington to her sister, Nancy Smith, March, 1809; *Marshall MSS.*

⁵⁹ Hugh Blair Grigsby, *The History of the Virginia Federal Convention of 1788*, Collections of the Virginia Historical Society, New Series, vols. 9-10 (Richmond, Va., 1891), IX, 176.

⁶⁰ Thomas Hart Benton, *Thirty Years View*, 2 vols., (New York, 1854), I, 681.

⁶¹ Wirt, *Letters*, p. 179.

⁶² Wirt, *Letters*, p. 179.

⁶³ Grigsby, *History*, IX, 182.

Filtering through all the contemporary descriptions of Marshall is a consistent stream of comment about his ability to make people like him. Jefferson called attention to Marshall's popularity in Richmond in a scathing passage which reflects Jefferson's disgruntlement with Marshall's political success as leader of the Virginia Federalists in 1795:

... His lax lounging manners have made him popular with the bulk of the people of Richmond, & a profound hypocrisy with many thinking men of our country. . . .⁶⁴

The curious anachronism of Marshall's strongly fixed conservatism, in combination with an ingratiating sensitivity to the feelings of other people, is the obvious key to much of Marshall's success in his public life. A comprehensive picture of the man was given us by Theodore Sedgwick, the Speaker of the House referred to earlier in this paper. The interest in this description is heightened by Sedgwick's effort to play the part of dispassionate critic for the recipient of his letter, since he was a little disgruntled with Marshall's independent actions in the House. To his friend, Rufus King, he wrote that:

... He [Marshall] is a man of a very affectionate disposition, of great simplicity of manners and honest & honorable in all his conduct. He is attached to pleasures, with convivial habits strongly fixed. He is indolent, therefore, and indisposed to take part in the common business of the house. He has a strong attachment to popularity but indisposed to sacrifice to it his integrity; hence it is that he is disposed on all popular subjects to feel the popular pulse and hence results indecision and the expression of doubt. . . . Doubts suggested by him create in more feeble minds those which are irremovable. . . . He is disposed to the exotic refinement, and to express great respect for the sovereign people, and to quote their opinions as an evidence of truth.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ T. Jefferson to J. Madison, November 26, 1795; in Ford, *Jefferson*, VII, 38.

⁶⁵ T. Sedgwick to R. King, May 11, 1800; in King, *King*, III, 237.

Palmer, in his appraisal of Marshall's judicial career, attributes a large degree of his success with his colleagues on the bench to the qualities of personality, particularly to the combination of firm convictions with a warm and conciliatory manner which enabled him to influence his colleagues in the Supreme Court so strongly.⁶⁶

This then was the speaker in action. He was tall, thin and ungainly, moved awkwardly, gestured little unless deeply moved. He gave an impression of firm and sincere conviction, but his "piercing black eyes"⁶⁷ radiated such a "faithful expression of great good humor and hilarity"⁶⁸ that the response to his utterances was more favorable than pure conviction might always warrant. In brief, John Marshall was possessed of a persuasively friendly personality which appeared to compensate for the defects of a relatively ungraceful delivery.

V. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SPEECH

There can be little doubt that the Jonathan Robbins address was one of the most effective of Marshall's career as an orator. Not only was its immediate effect recorded in the form of a House vote favorable to its arguments, but it has been lauded by Marshall's contemporaries and by those who have had occasion to comment on the debates of Congress in this period.

⁶⁶ "Marshall's domination of his judicial associates, and his leadership in the formation of a national opinion, were due in large measure to his engaging personality. In voice and manner he was mild, gentle and conciliating, though firm. He was a man of disarming candor, warmhearted cordiality, manifest sincerity, without bitterness or gall. He was marked for his quaint humor, hearty laughter, kindly jocularity. There was in him no austerity, no trace of the supercilious or cynical. He was unassuming and simple in manner. At home, on the circuit, and in the inn, throughout his life he was in close touch with the people." Ben W. Palmer, *Marshall and Taney* (Minneapolis, 1939), p. 68.

⁶⁷ Grigsby, *History*, IX, 176.

⁶⁸ Wirt, *Letters*, p. 178.

The most immediate and unequivocal measure of its effect was the House's reaction to the arguments in it. On the day following its delivery, after a brief rejoinder by Nicholas, the House voted to confirm the disagreement of the Committee of the Whole to the Livingston resolutions, 61 to 35.⁶⁹ This speech terminated the debate, for the House on Monday, March 10, moved to discharge the special committee from consideration of the case.

His contemporaries were universally favorable in their comments on Marshall's argument on this occasion. Albert Gallatin was reputed to have curtly rejected a suggestion that he answer it with the words,

... Answer it yourself; for my part I think it unanswerable. . . .⁷⁰

Thomas Jefferson, later an implacable political foe of Marshall, and certainly not friendly toward him during this period, unbent sufficiently to pen a grudging compliment on the quality of his argument on this occasion:

... The question has been decided today on Livingston's motion respecting Robbins, 35 for it, about 60 against it. Livingston, & Gallatin distinguished themselves on one side & J. Marshall greatly on the other.⁷¹

When evaluating this speech in his remarks at Marshall's death in 1835, Thomas Hart Benton, himself one of our nation's outstanding deliberative orators, said:

It [Jonathan Robbins case] was a judicial subject, adapted to the legal mind of Mr. Marshall,

requiring a legal pleading; and well did he plead it. Mr. Randolph [of Roanoke] has often been heard to say it distanced competition, leaving all associates and opponents far behind, and carrying the case. Seldom has one speech brought so much fame, and high appointment to one man.⁷²

His legal colleagues were equally eulogistic in their comments on the address. Joseph Story compared it to Lord Mansfield's celebrated *Answer to the Prussian Memorial*, in that it so effectively silenced opposition.⁷³ Horace Binney used this speech as an example of the type of argument in which Marshall excelled in the House.⁷⁴

The effectiveness of the Jonathan Robbins address was then both immediate and long-range, for Marshall not only secured the immediate response for which he was striving, but he also succeeded in settling certain issues in international law which had not hitherto been fully developed. The speech occasion was a felicitous combination of legal and political elements which enabled Marshall to display his best talents as an orator. Contemporaries and critics are agreed that the speaker acquitted himself in admirable fashion, and that his speech on the Jonathan Robbins case stands in the history of our Congress as a model of persuasive deliberative address.

⁷² Benton, *Thirty Years*, I 681.

⁷³ "It may be said of that speech, as was said of Lord Mansfield's celebrated *Answer to the Prussian Memorial*, it was reponse sans repliche, an answer so irresistible that it admitted of no reply. It silenced opposition, and settled then and forever the points of national law upon which the controversy hinged." Story, in Dillon, *Marshall*, III, 357.

⁷⁴ See Binney, in Dillon, *Marshall*, III, 312.

⁶⁹ *Annals*, X, 619.

⁷⁰ Grigsby, *History*, IX, 177.

⁷¹ T. Jefferson to J. Madison, March 4, 1800; in Ford, *Jefferson*, VII, 432.

THE EFFECTS OF THE PRESTIGE OF THE SPEAKER AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OPPOSING ARGUMENTS ON AUDIENCE RETENTION AND SHIFT OF OPINION*

STANLEY F. PAULSON

University of Minnesota

A STUDY by Haiman has shown that "variations in the prestige of the speaker produced by varying the chairman's introductory identification of him, were found to influence significantly the effectiveness of a persuasive speech in behalf of national compulsory health insurance—as shown by audience shift-of-opinion ballots in a classroom situation."¹

A study of the effectiveness of the "both sides" presentation was carried out in the Army and reported by Hovland, Lumsdaine, and Sheffield. They found that a "both sides" presentation was more effective than a "one side" presentation in securing shifts of opinion for those who were initially opposed to the speaker's point of view and for those who had a high school education or more; the "one side" presentation was more effective for those who were already favorable and for those who had not graduated from high school.²

This study sought to confirm the effects of the speaker's prestige and the "both sides" presentation in terms of shift of opinion. In addition, another criterion of effectiveness was employed: retention. Finally, through sub-group

analysis of the audience, the writer sought to establish whether the effectiveness of the speaker's prestige or the "both sides" presentation might be related to the sex, intelligence, amount of education, or initial attitudes of the listeners.

I. PROCEDURE

College students filled out a Woodward Shift-of-Opinion ballot on which they indicated whether they were in favor of, undecided, or against lowering the voting age to eighteen. Approximately one-half of the students heard a recorded speech favoring lowering the voting age by a speaker introduced as a sophomore at the University of Minnesota. The other half of the students heard the same recorded speech but, in this case, the speaker was introduced as a Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, the author of a book on voting habits of the American people, and past president of the American Political Science Association.

Approximately one-half of those who listened to the "student" and one-half of those who listened to the "professor" heard a speech which gave only arguments and evidence advocating lowering the voting age to eighteen, the "one side" speech. The other half of those who listened to the "student" and the "professor" heard a speech which briefly mentioned the leading argument against lowering the voting age as well as those favoring it, the "both sides" speech.

*Based upon Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1952, directed by Howard Gilkinson. The research was done under contract with the Office of Naval Research as contract N8-ONR-66216.

¹ Franklin S. Haiman, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos in Public Speaking," *SM*, XVI (1949), 201-227.

² C. I. Hovland, A. A. Lumsdaine, and F. D. Sheffield, *Experiments in Mass Communication*, Vol. III (Princeton, N. J., 1949), 201-227.

The arguments and evidence favoring the lowering of the voting age were the same in the "one side" and "both sides" speeches.

After each group heard one of the presentations, they filled out the Shift-of-Opinion Ballot indicating whether or not their attitude had changed. They then took a fifty-item multiple choice retention test on the material that was common to the "one side" and "both sides" speeches.

The subjects used in this study were students enrolled in the Fundamentals of Speech and the Communication courses in the College of Science, Literature and the Arts at the University of Minnesota during the winter and spring quarters of 1951-1952. The total group included 579 men and 399 women.

The speeches were organized as follows: At the beginning the speaker pointed out the importance of the issue and then said, "I shall review the main arguments on the question and then state my own position." In the "one side" speech he went on to give three main arguments supported by evidence, including examples, studies, authority, and historical precedent, all of which favored lowering the voting age to eighteen. This same material was included in the "both sides" speech but, in addition, the leading arguments against lowering the voting age were briefly mentioned. These opposing arguments were inserted in a specific pattern. A favorable argument was given first, then an opposing argument, then another favorable argument, etc. A favorable argument was supported in each case with evidence whereas the opposing argument was merely stated. The opposing arguments were not refuted but were simply followed by another favorable argument; if the opposing argument seemed rather strong, it was followed by an uncontro-

versial favorable argument and evidence which were considered very strong. The opposing arguments were mentioned in the early part of the speech so that the material presented in the latter half was all favorable to lowering the voting age. The "one side" speech was approximately thirteen minutes long and the "both sides" speech sixteen minutes in length.

II. RESULTS

Table I shows the percentage of shift of opinion for those who heard the speech in which the speaker was introduced as a sophomore at the University of Minnesota and for those who heard the same speech but with the speaker introduced as a Professor of Political Science from the University of Chicago. A significantly higher percentage of men who heard the "professor" shifted their opinions in the direction advocated by the speaker than did those men who heard the "student."

When these groups were analyzed as to initial attitude on the subject, the largest difference in percentage of shift of opinion was found among those who were initially favorable to the speaker's point of view (CR—3.61). Among the men who were initially favorable, there were twice as many shifts for those who heard the "professor" as for those who heard the "student." When the listeners were analyzed in terms of class in college, it was found that the prestige of the "professor" was more effective in securing shifts among men in the upper classes (CR—2.66) than among the men in the freshman class (CR—1.03).

Table II compares the "student" and the "professor" in terms of retention. No statistically significant differences appeared for men or women or for any of the sub-groups.

TABLE I
THE PERCENTAGE OF SHIFT OF OPINION FOR THE "STUDENT" AND THE "PROFESSOR."

	"Student"			"Professor"			Diff.	S.E.	C.R.
	N	Shifted	Percentage	N	Shifted	Percentage			
Men	286	90	31.5	293	130	44.4	12.9	4.13	3.12**
Women	199	104	52.3	200	93	46.5	-5.8	5.00	1.16
Total	485	194	40.0	493	223	45.2	5.2	3.16	1.65

**Significant above the 1% level.

TABLE II
RETENTION SCORES FOR THOSE LISTENING TO THE "STUDENT" AND THE "PROFESSOR."

	"Student"			"Professor"			Diff.	S.E.	C.R.
	N	Total Score	Mean	N	Total Score	Mean			
Men	286	10290	35.98	293	10319	35.22	-.76	.401	1.90
Women	199	6621	33.76	200	6753	33.76	.49	.566	.87
Total	485	16911	34.87	493	17072	34.65	-.24	.315	.76

Table III shows the percentage of listeners shifted in the direction intended by the speaker for the "one side" speech and the "both sides" speech. It will be noted that no significant differences between the two types of presentation appeared for either men or women. Furthermore, there were no significant differences for any of the other subdivisions of the data: initial attitude, A.C.E. scores, year in college.

Table IV indicates the retention scores of those who heard the "one side" and the "both side" speeches. A higher mean score for the men and for the group as a whole which heard the "both sides" speech is shown. The differences, though small, are significant statistically.

When the subjects were compared according to their initial attitude toward the speaker's thesis, it was found that the largest advantage for the "both sides" presentation was among those who were initially opposed to lowering the voting age (CR—2.11). When the subjects were compared on the basis of A.C.E. scores and the year in college, no significant differences emerged; the slight retention score advantage for the "both sides" treatment was approximately the same

whether the listener had a high or low A.C.E. score and whether he was a freshman or an upper classman.

All the results cited above have to do specifically with the two factors of prestige and acknowledgment of opposing arguments as they were variously presented to the listening groups. When the groups who heard all the different presentations were combined and analyzed, certain additional results appeared. As far as shift of opinion in the total subject group is concerned, it was found that women shifted more (49.37%) than did the men (39.72%). Further, the percentage of shift of opinion was shown to vary according to the initial attitude of the listeners, those initially undecided shifting most (60%), those initially favorable shifting next most (45.91%), and those initially against the speaker's thesis shifting least (33.49%).

An analysis of the retention scores of all the groups who heard the various presentations showed that men had higher mean retention scores than women (difference: 2.05, CR—6.05); that men and women who were initially favorable to the speaker's viewpoint had higher mean retention scores than those initial-

TABLE III
THE PERCENTAGE OF SHIFT OF OPINION FOR THE
"ONE SIDE" AND "BOTH SIDES" SPEECHES.

	"One Side" Speech			"Both Sides" Speech			Diff.	S.E.	C.R.
	N	Shifted	Percentage	N	Shifted	Percentage			
Men	283	115	40.64	296	116	38.85	-1.79	4.07	.44
Women	206	104	50.48	193	93	48.19	-2.29	5.01	.46
Total	489	219	44.79	489	208	42.54	-2.25	3.25	.69

TABLE IV
RETENTION SCORES FOR THOSE LISTENING TO THE "ONE SIDE" SPEECH AND THOSE
LISTENING TO THE "BOTH SIDES" SPEECH.

	"One Side" Speech			"Both Sides" Speech			Diff.	S.E.	C.R.
	N	Total Score	Mean	N	Total Score	Mean			
Men	283	9936	35.11	296	10709	36.18	1.07	.412	2.60**
Women	206	6910	33.54	193	6498	33.67	.13	.913	.14
Total	489	16846	34.45	489	17207	35.19	.74	.337	2.20*

**Significant at the 1% level.

*Significant at the 3% level.

ly against (difference: 1.21, CR—3.25); and that men and women who shifted in opinion had higher mean retention scores than those who did not shift (difference: .90, CR—2.78).

III. CONCLUSIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS

1. The men who heard the "professor" showed a significantly greater percentage of shift of opinion toward the speaker's thesis than did the men who heard the "student." Most of this difference was contributed by those who were initially favorable to the speaker's viewpoint.

2. Percentages of shift of opinion for women who heard the "professor" and the "student" were not significantly different.

3. Retention scores of those who heard the "professor" and those who heard the "student" were not significantly different.

4. The "both sides" speech did not produce a significantly greater shift of opinion than did the "one side" speech.

5. The "both sides" speech produced significantly higher mean retention

scores than did the "one side" speech among male listeners. Those who were initially opposed to the speaker's thesis showed the greatest difference.

6. Mean retention scores for the women who listened to the "both sides" speech were not significantly different.

7. When the groups who heard different presentations were combined, there was a significantly greater percentage of women who shifted in opinion than men.

8. Men had significantly higher mean scores in retention than did women.

9. The percentage of shift of opinion varied according to the initial attitudes of the listeners, those initially undecided showing the largest percentage (except for men who were initially favorable to the "professor"), those initially favorable showing the next largest percentage, and those initially opposed showing the smallest percentage of shift. Differences between these groups were significant statistically.

10. There were significant differences in mean scores in retention for

those who were initially favorable to the speaker's thesis as compared with those who were initially opposed, the former having the higher mean scores.

11. There were significant differences in mean scores in retention for those who shifted their opinions as compared with those who did not shift, the former having the higher mean scores.

This study did not, as Hovland's, show a significantly greater shift of opinion for the "both sides" presentation. One reason may have to do with a difference in the audience. The subjects in the present study were selected from a group with higher intelligence and more years of education than the group in the Hovland study. The average A.C.E. scores of the subjects in this study is at the 70th percentile of all students entering college and their average high school rank is at the 72nd percentile. Almost half of Hovland's group had not finished high school. These facts may be related to the effectiveness of the type of "both sides" treatment used here. The "both sides" presentation used in these studies merely mentions the opposing arguments; it does not develop them or support them with evidence. A less critical audience might be satisfied that both sides had been given but a more intelligent audience might not. Since the supposed advantage of this type of arrangement depends on satisfying the opposed listeners that the force of their position has been considered, this advantage might be lost where they are not thus satisfied. This may have happened in the present study. Further research might be carried out to see whether a

more comprehensive type of "both sides" speech would secure a greater shift of opinion among college students.

The higher mean score in retention for the "both sides" speech may be due to several causes. It may be, as Hovland hypothesized, that if the opposed listener hears some of his arguments stated, his reception of other statements will also be improved. It is also possible that since the "both sides" speech is longer, the subject is discussed more, and this influence scores in retention to some extent. Finally, it may be that the order of presentation of statements in the "both sides" speech encourages better attention. That is, in this speech the speaker says, "Those who favor lowering the voting age believe that . . . but those who oppose this change maintain that . . ." The juxtaposition of arguments may serve as a form of emphasis which draws attention to statements which follow. Such a focusing of attention might not occur when all the arguments are on the same side of the issue as in the "one side" speech.

The effect of the prestige of the speaker on shift of opinion was similar to the results Haiman secured with one important exception. In this study subgroup analysis revealed that the women did not shift significantly more for the prestige speaker than for the non-prestige speaker. No adequate explanation for this difference seems apparent, but it suggests the need for further research with sufficient analysis to establish differential reactions to prestige among groups with varying characteristics.

TENSION PATTERNS DURING STUTTERING IN RELATION TO CONFLICT, ANXIETY-BINDING, AND REINFORCEMENT

JOSEPH G. SHEEHAN and ROBERT B. VOAS*

University of California at Los Angeles

THE present study arose from an effort to gather experimental evidence bearing on the theory of stuttering as approach-avoidance conflict.¹ According to this theory, stuttering is a result of a conflict between opposed urges to speak and to hold back from speaking. The holding back may be due to either learned avoidances resulting from specific speech experiences, or to unconscious motives for avoiding, such as inhibition of unacceptable feelings, difficulty in interpersonal relations, or defensive needs on the part of the stutterer. These different sources of avoidance in a stutterer lead to approach-avoidance conflicts at different levels, and ultimately to a conflict which is experienced at the word level as a competition between speaking and not speaking.

Two questions are considered basic in the explanation of a stutterer's behavior: (1) What causes him to stop? (2) What enables him to continue? In turn, two hypotheses have been advanced as possible answers to these questions: (1) *The conflict hypothesis*: The stutterer stops whenever competing approach and avoidance tendencies reach an equilibrium. (2) *The fear-reduction*

hypothesis: During the moment of stuttering, there must be sufficient reduction of fear, conflict and avoidance tendency to permit release of the blocked word. The latter hypothesis, which is of most concern to this study, is an effort to answer the more general question: "What determines the moment of release, the moment at which the stutterer can finally say the word?"²

According to the approach-avoidance conflict theory, the stutterer should be able to go ahead only so long as the approach gradient is higher than the avoidance gradient. Since the avoidance gradient is steeper, as Miller's studies on conflict have shown,³ the stutterer or any organism caught in approach-avoidance conflict would be expected to advance toward the feared goal so long as the approach gradient is higher, and then stop or oscillate at the point where the avoidance gradient becomes higher. It is in this manner that the approach-avoidance conflict theory of stuttering accounts for the primary symptoms. The repetitions and prolongations reflect oscillations and fixations near the point of equilibrium in approach-avoidance conflict.⁴

The problem arises: If stuttering is

*Now at U. S. Naval School of Aviation Medicine, NAS, Pensacola, Florida.

¹ Joseph G. Sheehan, "A Theory of Stuttering as Approach-Avoidance Conflict," *American Psychologist*, V (1950), 469; also his "The Experimental Modification of Stuttering through Non-Reinforcement," *Jour. of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLVI (1951), 51-63, and Ph.D. dissertation, U. of Michigan, 1949, same title; "Theory and Treatment of Stuttering as an Approach-Avoidance Conflict," *Jour. of Psychology*, 36 (1953), 27-49.

² Joseph Sheehan, "A Study of the Phenomena of Stuttering," M.A. thesis, U. of Michigan, 1946, p. 69.

³ Neal E. Miller, "Experimental Studies of Conflict," in *Personality and the Behavior Disorders*, ed. by J. McV. Hunt, I (New York, 1944), 431-465; John Dollard and Neal Miller, *Personality and Psychotherapy* (New York, 1950), 352-369.

⁴ Sheehan, "Theory and Treatment of Stuttering. . ."

due to a conflict, how is the conflict resolved? If the avoidance tendency gains ascendance before the stutterer reaches the goal, how is he finally able to get there? If the stutterer cannot speak the word for a time because fear and avoidance tendencies are too strong, what enables him to speak it at all? By analysis of the respective gradients for approach and avoidance, we can explain his stopping at the beginning of a block. But how can we explain his release from the block? Why should he be in any better position to say the word at the end of a stuttering performance than he was at the beginning? After all, as Van Riper has shown, the symptoms of stuttering frequently bear little relevance to the actual speaking of the feared word.⁵

If the stutterer is to be released from the conflict situation which confronts him at the beginning of a block, one or both of two things will occur. Either the approach drive will be strengthened, or the avoidance tendency, fear, will be reduced. Although a case might be made out for the increase in approach drive, e.g., in terms of the possible effect of barriers in increasing motivation, it is the second possibility, the reduction of fear and avoidance tendency, that is the focus of this investigation.

Two further hypotheses, which may be stated here for future investigation, are mechanisms by which the actual occurrence of stuttering could be expected to lead to a reduction of fear and avoidance: (1) a large part of the stutterer's fear is tied up with his effort to avoid the stuttering. Once the thing he has feared has begun to occur, he can no

longer avoid it completely; and his motivation for a cause of action no longer available to him would inevitably decrease. (2) As the stutterer approaches the block, he is able to receive more and more of a proprioceptive feedback from the rehearsal behavior which Van Riper and others have shown to be present at the moment of stuttering. He therefore progresses from a vague, pervasive fear of the unknown to a more localized, controllable fear of a specific length and form of the stuttering block. The generalized anxiety is reduced, he gets more of a feeling of control, and there is a reduction of the element of fear from a sense of helplessness.

These hypotheses have interesting ramifications in terms of the relationship between stuttering and the fear which motivates it. Van Riper states that successful avoidance of stuttering increases the stutterer's fear and causes more trouble in the long run.⁶ This paradoxical relationship is clarified by the concept of stuttering behavior itself as fear-reducing. When the stuttering does not occur, the anxiety is not dissipated, is built up and leads eventually to more trouble. However, when the stuttering does occur, it reduces the fear which elicited it. In turn, the behavior which reduced the fear, the stuttering itself, is reinforced and strengthened.⁷

In theoretical terms the stuttering may be thought of as similar to tics and compulsive acts, in having "anxiety-binding" properties. When the behavior occurs the anxiety is reduced; when it does not, the anxiety may build up to become almost unbearable.⁸ This may help us understand why on one hand we frequently find severe stutterers who

⁵ Charles Van Riper, "The Effect of Devices for Minimizing Stuttering on the Creation of Symptoms," *Jour. of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XXXII (1937), 185-192. Also see his *Stuttering* (Chicago, 1948), pp. 19-20; and *Speech Correction: Principles and Methods* (New York, rev. ed., 1947), pp. 269, 277, 287, 321-322.

⁶ Van Riper, *Speech Correction*, pp. 284-285.

⁷ Sheehan, "Theory and Treatment of Stuttering. . ." Also his "The Modification of Stuttering. . ."

⁸ Sigmund Freud, *The Problem of Anxiety* (New York, 1936), p. 85.

bear their blocks with relative equanimity, and highly internalized stutterers who suffer agonies in anticipation of blockings that never quite happen.

The present study was motivated by the fear-reduction hypothesis, viz., that during the moment of stuttering there must be sufficient reduction of fear and avoidance tendency to permit release. In this connection a stimulating lead was provided by a finding from an unpublished study by Van Riper, in which there appeared to be a decrease in the rate and amplitude of jaw tremors during a block.⁹ This suggested that it might be possible to find measures of tension patterns which reflect changes in anxiety level surrounding the moment of stuttering.

The experimental findings on muscle tension in relation to a number of psychological factors have been summarized by Voas as follows: (1) Muscle tension reflects degree and type of mental activity; (2) degree of muscle tension may affect mental activity; (3) characteristic individual differences in the amount of tension suggest that this may be a personality trait; (4) abnormals show more tension under stress than do normals; (5) *the locus of tension may be related to psychosomatic symptomology*.¹⁰

Malmo, Shagass, and Davis found that abnormal groups and neurotics showed more muscular tensions, and that more muscle tension appears in the region of psychosomatic symptoms.¹¹ For example,

⁹ Charles Van Riper, "The Relation of Tremors to Perpetuation and Release from the Stuttering Spasm," unpubl. paper, read at 1939 convention of the American Speech Correction Association, Chicago.

¹⁰ Robert B. Voas, "Generalization and Consistency of Muscle Tension Level," Ph.D. dissertation, U. of California, Los Angeles, 1952. (Italics added.)

¹¹ Robert B. Malmo, Charles Shagass, and Frederick H. Davis, "Specificity of Bodily Directions Under Stress. A Physiological Study of Somatic Symptoms, Mechanisms in Psychiatric Patients," *Research Publications of the Association for Nervous and Mental Disorders*, 29 (1950), 656-664.

subjects who complained of headaches demonstrated greater tension in the scalp muscles, while subjects who complained of pain in the back demonstrated greater tension in that area. Furthermore, for a given subject, tension would increase during periods when he complained of greater pain. These findings corroborated an earlier study by Wolff on headache.¹²

From these findings with other psychological symptoms, we would expect stutterers to show relatively greater tension in those muscle groups involved in speech, especially at or near the moment of blocking. A further indication of this as a fruitful area for study comes from a finding by Voas that, of seven muscle groups studied, the masseter gave the greatest percentage increase under conditions of stress and startle.¹³ For these reasons, we selected the masseter as an indicator of tension surrounding the moment of stuttering.

Williams recently obtained masseter muscle action potentials on 15 stutterers and 15 nonstutterers under conditions of nonstuttering, stuttering, faked stuttering, and jaw movements without speech. His findings point to certain dangers inherent in the interpretation of masseter action potentials, due to the difficulty of distinguishing emotionally produced tension from jaw movements per se.¹⁴ Williams did not undertake to provide information on tension at different stages during the stuttering block.

The present study is concerned with the relative amounts of tension which occur at different stages during the moment of stuttering. From the approach-

¹² Harold G. Wolff, *Headache and Other Head Pains* (New York, 1948).

¹³ Voas, "Generalization and Consistency of Muscle Tension Level."

¹⁴ Dean E. Williams, "An Evaluation of Masseter Muscle Action Potentials in Stuttered and Nonstuttered Speech," Ph.D. dissertation, State U. of Iowa, 1952.

avoidance conflict theory of stuttering, we should expect overt tension to increase as the stutterer approaches the moment of release, since this brings him closer to the feared goal of speaking. As noted by Sheehan:

A paradoxical effect of fear-reduction during the block may be inferred from the nature of the conflict. By the lowering of the avoidance gradient, the stutterer is brought closer to the feared goal and hence may experience a paradoxical increase in "fear elicited" . . . Two shifts are occurring at once. For a given amount of fear and avoidance tendency, the point at which the stutterer initially stops is determined in part by the strength of the approach drive, which is in turn a function of his need to communicate and ability to tolerate anxiety. When he reaches the point of stoppage the stuttering begins to occur, reducing the fear which elicited it and lowering the avoidance gradient so that he moves closer to the goal. . . . The fear reduction which determines the release may be obscured somewhat by a simultaneous increase in fear, conflict and avoidance strength with the nearing of the feared goal.¹⁵

For the foregoing reasons, the fear-reduction which determines the release is not directly available to test, but must be stated as an assumption based on logical grounds and other experimental data. The evidence supporting the hypothesis of fear-reduction during the block has been summarized elsewhere.¹⁶

In this study the significant prediction is that if stuttering behavior does follow the same laws as those which govern approach-avoidance conflict, the fear-reduction which permits the release should result in an increase in manifest tension as the stutterer nears the feared goal of finally speaking the word.

I. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

Electromyographic recordings from the right masseter muscle were obtained from twelve subjects (S's) during the

speaking of a word list (Table I). The subjects were 11 male and 1 female stutterers ranging in age from 19 to 40. The S's were or had been members of a speech therapy group and presented the usual variety in nature of the overt symptoms.

The recordings were taken on a Grass Four-channel E.E.G. One channel was used to record the electromyograph. The amplifier was coupled to S via an appropriate (.033 seconds decay time) filtering system. A second channel of the amplifier was used to record the output of a Bell Telephone microphone placed to pick up any sound spoken by the subject. A common solenoid marker was used to record the word presentation automatically. By means of an electrically operated 25 mm. film strip projector, single words were thrown upon a screen. The words were projected black on white, four inches high, at a distance of ten feet from the subject. No subjects evinced any difficulty in reading comprehension with the words employed. S was in an electrically shielded room separate from the E.E.G. and the projector. In this way it was possible to keep equipment noise at a minimum. A window between the rooms permitted observation of S by E. Communication between E and S was made possible by means of a two-way speaker system. The entire experimental procedure was recorded on tape.

When S entered the laboratory he was first oriented to the equipment. S was then instructed to lie supine upon a cot, with head supported by pillows in such manner that the projector screen could be easily and comfortably seen. Two 1/4 inch silver electrodes were filled with Cambridge electrode jelly and attached with collodion to the rear of the right jaw. The electrodes were placed one above the other, one inch apart, over the masseter muscle. The top elec-

¹⁵ Sheehan, "Theory and Treatment of Stuttering. . ."

¹⁶ Sheehan, "Theory and Treatment of Stuttering. . ."

trode was one inch in front of the ear lobe.

Following the application of the electrodes, S was instructed to relax and to move as little as possible during the experimental sessions. A five minute rest period was then provided to facilitate S's relaxation. One of the following three sets of instructions were then given:

Listened to these instructions carefully, because each time they will be different.

CONTROL (C)

You will be shown a list of selected words several times. Say each word as soon as you see it in the way most natural for you at this time. Do not fake any stuttering that would not otherwise occur, and don't use any special technique to handle your blocks. Don't say any words other than the one in front of you. If you have any questions, ask them now or wait until the end of the experiment.

POSTPONEMENT-REHEARSAL (P-R)

You will be shown a list of selected words several times. Do not speak the word until you feel you can say it without stuttering. Wait for the fear to die down and you feel you can say it successfully. If you find yourself stuttering, you're not taking enough time, so wait longer on the next word. Don't say any words other than the one in front of you, and don't fake any stuttering or use any special techniques to handle your blocks. If you have any questions, ask them now or wait until the end of the experiment.

NON-REINFORCEMENT (N-R)

You will be shown a list of selected words several times. Say each word as soon as you see it in the way most natural for you at this time. Do not fake any stuttering that would not otherwise occur, and don't use any special technique to handle your blocks. Don't say any words other than the one in front of you. If you stutter on the word, say it again and again rapidly until you can say it normally; without any stuttering. For example, if the word were "today" and you had a block on it, it would be like this "t-t-t-today, t-t-today, t-t-today, today." Now try it on some other words to see if you have the idea okay. When you have said the word fluently one or more times, pause. We will flash the word off, then go on to the next word. If you have any questions, ask them now or wait until the end of the experiment.

Following each set of instructions, a set of ten words from the lists given in Table I were flashed one at a time on

TABLE I
Word List¹⁷

Waitress	Pitchfork	Whitewash
Disaster	Thinking	Tapestry
Workmanship	Kerchief	Judicial
Yesterday	Musician	Balcony
Rhinestone	Chairman	Locality
Shortcake	Zealous	Guarantee
Kindergarten	Singular	Gabardine
Dangerous	Vulgarity	Zoology
General	Vegetable	Necessity
Shudder	Bombardment	Whipcord

the screen. The interval between word presentations was varied; however, S was never shown the next word until he had completed the previous one. The sequence of the three sets of instructions was determined according to the design in Table II.

TABLE II
EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Subjects ¹⁸	Word List		
	I	II	III
1	C	PR	NR
2	C	NR	PR
3	PR	C	NR
4	PR	NR	C
5	NR	C	PR
6	NR	PR	C

Key: C = control condition; PR = postponement rehearsal; NR = non-reinforcement.

Three performance measures were taken: (1) the occurrence or non-occurrence of stuttering; (2) the time in seconds between the first speech sounds made by the subject and the maximum masseter response; (3) the time in seconds from maximum masseter response to the termination of the word. The speaking of a word by the stutterer was judged as an instance of stuttering if he showed abnormal hesitation, evidence of blockage or employing any special

¹⁷ Taken from a list of forty words used by James Frick, "An Exploratory Study of the Effect of Punishment (Electric Shock) upon Stuttering Behavior," Ph.D. dissertation, State U. of Iowa, 1951, pp. 1-74.

¹⁸ Twelve subjects were used in all; therefore the design was replicated once.

technique to speak the word. In an independent check the experimenters established sufficient reliability in making these judgments for the purpose of the study.

For the second measure, Distance A, ("masseter delay") the moment at which the first audible speech attempt was made was determined by reference to the microphone record. The record paper was divided by lines 6 mm apart, which at the paper speed used (60 mm per second) represented .1 second. The recorded data were the number of such spaces from the first deflection of the microphone pen to the point of maximum masseter activity.

The third measure, Distance B, represented the number of spaces from the point of maximum masseter activity to the termination of sound as reflected in the microphone record.

Since the point of maximum activity is a function of both frequency and amplitude and therefore difficult to quantify, a subjective judging method was used. The .1 second period between the first and last speech sounds when the maximum masseter activity occurred was judge by one of the experimenters. To check the reliability of this method an individual completely unfamiliar with electromyography independently scored two records (60 words). The reliability co-efficient thus obtained was .89. It was concluded that this method of scoring the EMG tracing was sufficiently reliable for the present study.

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Originally, a multivariate analysis of variance was planned, using the design given in Table II. However, this was not possible due to incomplete data caused by machine failure. The three types of instructions were compared via a one-dimension analysis of variance. The same procedure was used to com-

pare the three word lists. Neither instructions nor word lists proved to have a significant effect upon "masseter delay" and therefore were not considered further. Only the relationship of delay time to speech blocks is reported below.

Though all twelve subjects had been referred for stuttering, and were under therapy for speech defects, six subjects (group 2) were fluent throughout the experimental procedure. These subjects were used as a "control" group for the six subjects (group 1) who had one or more blocks during the experiment. The mean Distance A or "masseter delay" for stuttered words and for fluent words was calculated for each subject in group 1. Fortunately it was possible to pair on the basis of experimental treatment each subject in group 1 with a fluent subject in group 2. For each subject in group 2 a mean masseter delay time was calculated for those words on which the man from group 1, with whom he was paired, had stuttered. A mean was also calculated for those words on which his partner had been fluent. These data are presented in Table III.

All six subjects in group 1 had longer "masseter delay" (Distance A) during blocks than during fluency. The mean delay time for words on which blocks occurred was .401 seconds, while for fluent words the mean was .272 seconds. An analysis of variance of this difference (See Table IV, Analysis A) yields an F ratio of 14.83, which is significant at the $P < .01$ level. In this test, subject differences were controlled, but differences between words were not. To correct for this factor a second test was made in which the blocked words for group 1 were compared with the corresponding words for group 2. (See Table IV, Analysis B.) The F ratio for the difference between these means (.401 vs. .290) was 13.35 which is significant at the $P < .01$ level.

TABLE III
(DISTANCE A)
DELAY TIME IN SECONDS FOR BLOCKED AND FLUENT
WORDS FOR TWO GROUPS OF STUTTERERS.

Group 1			Group 2		
Subject	Stuttered Words	Fluent Words	Subject	Word on which Partner Stuttered	Words on which Partner was Fluent
#1	.375	.336	#7	.288	.336
#2	.431	.207	#8	.262	.280
#9	.314	.300	#3	.250	.230
#4	.358	.278	#10	.325	.272
#5	.500	.210	#11	.300	.228
#6	.427	.300	#12	.318	.293
Means	.401	.272		.290	.273

TABLE IV
RESULTS OF TWO ANALYSES OF VARIANCE BETWEEN
BLOCKED WORDS AND CONTROL WORDS.

Analysis A Group 1, Stuttered Words vs. Group 1, Fluent Words.				
Source	ss	df	s ²	F
Total	8.65	11	—	
Between groups	5.19	1	5.19	14.83
Within groups	3.46	10	.35	

Analysis B Group 1, Stuttered Words vs. Group 2, Words on which Partner Stuttered.				
Source	ss	df	s ²	F
Total	6.11	11	—	
Between groups	3.47	1	3.47	13.35
Within groups	2.64	10	.26	

A similar analysis carried out on the interval from maximum tension to the end of vocalization, Distance B, yielded nonsignificant results. The mean delay time for stuttered words was .510, while that for fluent words was .548. For this difference to be nonsignificant, it is necessary that the time from peak tension to release in stuttering be reasonably close to that for fluent utterance—in other words, the peak tension during stuttering occurs close to the release.

Combining these results, there is apparently a tension buildup during the stuttering block, which reaches a peak and terminates close to the point of release, or eventual utterance of the word. These findings are in accord with the predictions that would be made from

the theory of stuttering as an approach-avoidance conflict.

Can it be argued that the difference is due simply to a greater length of time consumed by the stuttering block? This is true but does not affect the prediction and the results. If the point of maximum tension was at the beginning of the block, there would be a significant difference in Distance B but none in Distance A. That is, the maximum tension point, by occurring at the beginning of the block, would not differ materially from that during fluent speech; however, there would be a longer interval from maximum tension to end of vocalization, (Distance B) during the stuttering. It was in Distance A that the significant difference appeared.

Hence the point of maximum tension occurs late in the block, near the release, just as would be expected from the concept of stuttering as an approach-avoidance conflict.

It should be noted that the stutterers served as their own controls in these studies, in that their masseter tension patterns during blocking were compared with those during their fluent speech. The assumption involved, and hereby made explicit, is that since stutterers block only a small percentage of the time, their fluently spoken words may be used as normal speech controls. Although this assumption will not meet universal acceptance, there is still tremendous practical and theoretical value in finding differences in tension patterns between the blocked and the fluent words spoken by stutterers.

Because of the inherent measurement difficulties involved in a study of masseter tension patterns, and because of the assumptions required, there is still a definite need to corroborate the conflict and fear-reduction hypotheses in terms of other experimental approaches.

To the extent that the assumptions stated in the study are acceptable, however, the obtained experimental data support the theory of stuttering as an approach-avoidance conflict.

III. SUMMARY

This study was an effort to gather experimental evidence bearing on a theory

of stuttering as approach-avoidance conflict. From the nature of approach-avoidance conflict, it was predicted that there would be an increase in fear elicited as the stutterer moved through the block, hence closer to the "feared goal" of speaking. Paradoxically, this increase in manifest tension results from the fear-reduction which must occur during the moment of stuttering in order for the release to take place. Experimental studies on muscle tension by Voas and others suggested a method for checking the patterns of tension during the stuttering block.

Electromyographic recordings from the right masseter muscle were obtained on twelve adult stutterers during the speaking of a word list. The time between the first speech sounds produced by the subject and the point of maximum masseter activity was determined. This point was found to occur significantly later during stuttering than during fluent speech. Since this result may be taken to indicate more tension at the end of a stuttering block than at the beginning, the results are in accordance with predictions made from the theory of stuttering as approach-avoidance conflict. A discussion is presented of a number of theoretical relationships, especially those between fear-reduction, muscle tension patterns, anxiety-binding, reinforcement, and stuttering as an approach-avoidance conflict.

THE PERSISTENCY OF THE EFFECT ON AUDIENCE ATTITUDE OF THE FIRST VERSUS THE SECOND ARGUMENTATIVE SPEECH OF A SERIES

HARVEY CROMWELL
Mississippi State College for Women

IN a previous article,¹ this writer reported the immediate effect on audience attitude of the first versus the second argumentative speech of a series. The experimental investigation on which that article was based also included data for studying the persistency, after thirty days, of the effect of the order of presentation (first or second) on the attitude of the listeners. The present article is designed to present those data.

I. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

The argumentative speeches, subjects,² attitude scale, experimental procedure, and statistical methods used for collecting and analyzing the data on which the present article is based are the same as previously reported³ with the following exceptions:

1. Thirty days after completion of the original experiment, the subjects completed an additional form of the attitude scale.
2. The control group was also used to measure any variable that might have been introduced into the experiment, beyond the control of the investigator, during the thirty days intervening between the original experiment and the retest.

¹ Harvey Cromwell, "The Relative Effect on Audience Attitude of the First versus the Second Argumentative Speech of a Series," SM, XVII (1950), 105-122. Based upon Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, directed by A. H. Monroe.

² The difference in the number of auditors used in the two studies is due to absences from classes on days the retests were made and to class schedules that prevented conducting retests.

³ Cromwell, 107-115. Also see Harvey Cromwell, "An Experimental Design for Determining Induced Changes in the Attitudes of Others," *Southern Speech Journal*, XVI (1951), 198-206.

II. RESULTS

In the original study, the immediate effect on audience attitude of the position (first or second) in which an argumentative speech was presented was analyzed for three different speaking situations. The data of the present article will thus be considered as they apply to those speaking situations.

A. When Affirmative and Negative Speeches are Presented on the Same Proposition⁴

The specific objective here was to determine which position, the first or second, has the greater influence on audience attitude after a thirty-day period when recorded affirmative and negative speeches judged as possessing equal strength and of approximately the same length are presented on the same proposition.

A test of the subjects available for the present report confirmed the results of the original study that when strong, equally effective, recorded affirmative and negative speeches are presented on the same proposition, the speech presented in the second position has the greater immediate influence on the attitude of the listeners; but, when the speeches are judged to be equal but weak in effectiveness, there is no evidence that either speech presented in the first or second position has the greater influence.

A comparison of the persistency after

⁴ Cromwell, 115-117.

thirty days of the effect of the order of presentation (first or second) on the attitude of the listeners who heard affirmative and negative speeches on the same equal to .105 and .181, respectively. These differences represent persistencies after thirty days that were 35% and 40%, respectively, of the immediate

TABLE I
A COMPARISON OF THE PERSISTENCY AFTER THIRTY DAYS OF THE EFFECT
OF THE ORDER OF PRESENTATION (FIRST OR SECOND) ON THE ATTITUDE
OF LISTENERS WHO HEARD AFFIRMATIVE AND NEGATIVE SPEECHES
ON THE SAME PROPOSITION.

Speeches Compared*	N (Auditors)	Sum of the shifts in attitude persisting toward the speech presented in:		Diff. of the means	S.E. of diff. of the means	t	P
		1st pos.	2nd pos.				
LA-LN; LN-LA	152	51.88	79.35	.181	.124	1.46	.14
MA-MN; MN-MA	156	53.73	70.14	.105	.089	1.18	.24
WMA-WMN; WMN-WMA	164	64.07	63.40	.004	.087	.05	.96

*LA, Labor Affirmative; LN, Labor Negative; MA, Medicine Affirmative; MN, Medicine Negative; WMA, Weaker Medicine Affirmative; WMN, Weaker Medicine Negative.

proposition in terms of the standard error of the difference of the mean shift in the attitude of the auditors is shown in Table I.

As noted in Table I, the *t*'s representing the greater influence on audience attitude after thirty days of the speech presented in the second position was equal to 1.18 for those who heard strong Medicine speeches, 1.46 for those who heard the Labor speeches, and .05 for those who heard the weaker Medicine speeches. While significance ratios of 1.18 and 1.46 are not normally acceptable as possessing statistical significance, they do indicate the odds are 7.4 to 1 and 12.9 to 1 that the greater influence of the strong Medicine and Labor speeches presented in the second position persisted after thirty days.

As may also be noted in Table I, the differences of the means representing the greater influence after thirty days of the strong Medicine and Labor speeches presented in the second position were

greater influence⁵ of the strong Medicine and Labor speeches presented in the second position.

B. When Speeches of Unequal Strength are Presented on the Same Side of a Proposition⁶

The specific objective here was to determine which order of presentation, stronger-weaker or weaker-stronger, has the greater cumulative effect on the attitude of the audience after thirty days when recorded argumentative speeches of equal length but rated as unequal in strength are presented on the same side of a proposition.

A test of the subjects available confirmed the results reported in the original study that the greater cumulative effect on audience attitude results

⁵ The difference of the means representing the greater immediate influence on the attitude of the listeners of the speech presented in the second position was .457 for the Labor speeches, .302 for the strong Medicine speeches, and .081 for the weaker Medicine speeches.

⁶ Cromwell, 117-119.

from presenting the weaker argumentative speech followed by the stronger argumentative speech.

A comparison of the persistency after thirty days of the cumulative effect on the attitude of the listeners of presenting unequal argumentative speeches on the same side of a proposition in the sequence of weaker-strong and strong-weaker is shown in Table II.

the attitude of the listeners after thirty days than does the sequence of strong-weaker. A comparison of the cumulative effect of the order of presentation (weaker-strong and strong-weaker) that persisted after a thirty-day period revealed that the listeners who heard the speeches presented in the order of weaker-strong retained 65% more of their original shift in attitude than did those

TABLE II
A COMPARISON OF THE PERSISTENCY AFTER THIRTY DAYS OF THE CUMULATIVE EFFECT ON THE ATTITUDE OF LISTENERS OF PRESENTING UNEQUAL SPEECHES IN THE SEQUENCE OF WEAKER-STRONG AND STRONG-WEAKER.

Speech Combination Compared	N (Auditors)	Sum of the shifts in attitude persisting when order of presentation was:		Diff. of the means	S.E. of diff. of the means	t	P
		Strong-weaker	Weaker-strong				
(MA-WMA) (WMA-MA); (MN-WMN) (WMN-M)	316	58.20	102.65	.141	.097	1.45	.14

As may be noted in Table II, the t representing the greater cumulative effect on the attitude of the listeners after thirty days of presenting the two speeches in the order of weaker-strong is equal to 1.45. While a significance ratio of this size is not normally acceptable as possessing statistical significance, it does indicate the odds are 12.6 to 1 that the order of presenting the two speeches in the sequence of weaker-strong exercises a greater influence on

who heard the speeches presented in the order of strong-weaker.

C. When Argumentative Speeches are Presented on Two Propositions⁷

The specific objective here was to determine which position, first or second, has the greater influence on audience attitude after thirty days when equally strong, recorded argumentative speeches of approximately the same length are

⁷ Cromwell, 119-121.

TABLE III
A COMPARISON OF THE PERSISTENCY AFTER THIRTY DAYS OF THE EFFECT ON THE ATTITUDE OF AUDITORS WHO HEARD ARGUMENTATIVE SPEECHES JUDGED EQUALLY STRONG ON TWO DIFFERENT PROPOSITIONS.

Speeches Used	N (Auditors)	Sum of the shifts in audience attitude persisting toward the speech presented in:		Diff. of the means	S.E. of the diff. of the means	t	P
		1st pos.	2nd pos.				
LN-MA; MA-LN	147	33.84	52.99	.130	.155	.83	.41
LA-MN; MN-LA	142	44.02	64.35	.143	.142	1.00	.32
MN-LN; LN-MN	153	135.91	104.97	.202	.193	1.04	.30
MA-LA; LA-Ma	145	17.80	11.69	.042	.127	.33	.74

presented on two different propositions.

A test of the subjects available confirmed the results reported in the original study that there is no evidence that either the first or the second position has a greater influence on audience attitude when equally strong argumentative speeches of approximately the same length are presented on two different propositions.

As noted in Table III, *t*'s representing the greater influence on audience attitude after thirty days of the position (first or second) in which equally strong, recorded argumentative speeches of approximately the same length are presented on two different propositions do not favor either position of presentation. While the *t*'s for the speeches presented in the sequence LN-MA; MA-LN and LA-MN; MN-LA are equal to .83 and 1.00, respectively, and indicate odds of 3.9 to 1 and 5.3 to 1 favoring the greater persistency of the speech presented in the *second* position, the *t* for the speeches presented in the sequence MN-LN; LN-MN is equal to 1.04 and indicates odds of 5.7 to 1 favoring the greater influence of the speech presented in the *first* position. The *t* for the speeches

An examination of the data in Table IV will show no statistically significant shift in attitude occurred among the members of the control groups during the time required to conduct the experiments.

Although it was not a specific objective of the present study, it should be interesting to note the data presented in A and B, above, support the conclusions of other investigators⁸ that the immediate shift in audience attitude produced by an argumentative speech does not persist; instead, the auditors tend to regress with the passing of time toward their original attitude.

III. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the experimental data reported and analyzed in this article, several conclusions regarding the persistency after thirty days of the effect on the attitude of listeners of the order in which argumentative speeches are presented seem justified. However, only so far as the experimental conditions and subjects represent a situation typical of the speaker-audience phenomenon in general should the conclusions be inter-

TABLE IV
A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE CONTROL GROUPS
DURING THE THIRTY-DAY PERIOD.

Propositions Used	N (Auditors)	Mean of the pre-speech attitude	Mean of the attitude thirty days later	Diff. of the means	S.E. of the diff. of the means	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
Medicine	73	6.254	6.311	.057	.150	.38	.70
Labor	72	7.805	7.745	.060	.151	.40	.69

presented in the sequence MA-LA; LA-MA is equal to .33. Thus it may be concluded there is no evidence that either the first or the second position has a greater influence on audience attitude after thirty days when equally strong, recorded argumentative speeches are presented on two different propositions.

⁸ See R. M. Bateman and H. H. Remmers, "A Study of the Shifting Attitude of High School Students When Subjected to Favorable and Unfavorable Propaganda," *Jour. Social Psychology*, XIII (1941), 395-406; W. K. C. Chin, "Retention of the Effect of Oral Propaganda," *Jour. Social Psychology*, VII (1936), 479-483; H. Cromwell and R. Kunkel, "An Experimental Study of the Effect on the Attitude of Listeners of Repeating the Same Oral Propaganda," *Jour. Social Psychology*, XXXV (1952), 175-184; P. E. Lull, "The Effectiveness of Humor in Persuasive Speeches," *SM*, VII (1940), 26-40.

preted as having unrestricted general application.

In general:

1. The conclusions of the present study regarding the persistency after a delay of thirty days of the effect on audience attitude of the first versus the second argumentative speech of a series are in each instance similar to the conclusions of the original study concerning the immediate effect of the order (first or second) in which argumentative speeches are presented.

2. The relative effect on audience attitude after a thirty-day period of presenting a recorded argumentative speech first or second in a sequence is not the same under all conditions; instead, the persistency of the relative effect of the order of presentation varies with the particular combination of speeches in the sequence.

Specifically:

3. When recorded strong affirmative and negative speeches of approximately the same length which have been judged equally effective are presented on the same proposition, the evidence indicates the greater persistency of the influence on the attitude of the listeners after thirty days lies with the speech presented in the second position.

4. There is no evidence that the greater persistency of the influence on

the attitude of the listeners after thirty days lies with the speech presented in either the first or second position if the affirmative and negative speeches presented on the same proposition have been judged as equal but weak in effectiveness.

5. When oral arguments are presented on the same side of a proposition in recorded speeches of approximately the same length but rated as possessing unequal strength, the evidence indicates the greater persistency of the influence on the attitude of the listeners after thirty days occurs when the weaker speech is presented first and the stronger speech is presented second.

6. There is no evidence that either the speech presented in the first or second position exercises a greater influence on the attitude of the listeners after thirty days if the two recorded argumentative speeches, judged equally strong, are presented on two different propositions.

In addition to the conclusions above which apply to the basic problem of this experimental investigation, the data also confirm the conclusion of other investigators that the immediate shift in audience attitude produced by an argumentative speech does not persist; instead, the auditors tend to regress with the passing of time toward their original attitude.

"NOT FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING A SPEECH:" ANDREW JOHNSON'S SWING AROUND THE CIRCLE

GREGG PHIFER

The Florida State University

ON Andrew Johnson's famous "Swing Around the Circle" in the fall of 1866, he sought to carry to the people his case for speedy restoration of the former Confederate states. This was the policy of presidential reconstruction inaugurated by his predecessor and adopted after much soul-searching by the Tennessean. As the 7:30 Baltimore and Ohio pulled out of Washington on the morning of August 28, Johnson may have seen in his mind's eye the wildly cheering crowds that greeted him in Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana during the 1864 presidential campaign.¹ Could he not rally them once more in a new crusade to defeat northern exclusionists at the ballot box as they had beaten southern secessionists on the field of battle?

There is no doubt that Johnson sought to appeal his case over the heads of the politicians to the common people of the northern states. He wanted to explain his cause face-to-face, to make the kind of give-and-take stump speeches to which Tennessee politics had accustomed him. He would not believe that the people of the North could be deaf to his reasons, blind to his sincerity, unable or unwilling to respond to his message of peace and reconciliation. But the President had no training, taste, or desire to make the formal, studied addresses Abraham Lincoln had prepared during his term in the presidency.² Andrew Johnson was the "Tail-

or President," the self-made, self-educated man, and it is useless to wish or picture him otherwise.

I. LACK OF SPECIFIC PREPARATION

The President made no written preparation for the talks of his tour. He had no manuscripts or outlines, nothing but prolonged study and serious thought concerning the issues. At New York City, one of his first major stops, he said: "It has never been my habit to prepare speeches, but rather to take up a subject, having previously thought upon it of course, and talk about it. The very idea of making a formal preparation has always disqualified me." Later, on the same occasion he repeated the idea: "I have never made a prepared speech in my life, and only treat these topics as they occur to me."³

Johnson's words are specific; he relied completely on general preparation. This had been his habit in Tennessee campaigns, and it was the only method he felt competent to use. State papers he would revise carefully or ask some trusted associate to prepare.⁴ Oral persuasion was his art; its techniques he had learned through long experience.⁵ He would talk freely and frankly with those he trusted best: the people of the United States.

³ Text of the New York speech from Edward McPherson, *The Political History of the United States of America During the Period of the Reconstruction* (Washington, 1871), pp. 129-134.

⁴ William A. Dunning, "More Light on Andrew Johnson," *American Historical Review*, XI (April, 1906), 574-594.

⁵ Joseph H. Baccus, "The Oratory of Andrew Johnson," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1941.

¹ George Fort Milton, *The Age of Hate* (New York, 1939), pp. 123-124.

² John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Abraham Lincoln, A History* (New York, 1866), III, 319-344.

Repeatedly the President told his audience along the way that he had no intention of making them a speech, meaning, of course, that he had not planned a long or formal address. But as he was passing through on his way to dedicate a monument to Stephen A. Douglas in Chicago, he felt compelled to acknowledge the welcome accorded him by the crowds along the way. And this public demonstration, he frequently pointed out, was one more evidence that the people supported him and his policies of conciliation, conservative (presidential) reconstruction, and the speedy restoration of the Union. This led him naturally into a discussion of the issue between himself and Congress, a subject pent up inside Johnson for more than six months and just waiting a good opportunity for public discussion.⁶

Take, for example, his appearance at Philadelphia on the first day out of Washington: "In visiting Philadelphia . . . it was not for the purpose of making a speech, but I am on my way . . . to . . . Chicago . . . and in being here today . . . I must be permitted to tender to the citizens of Philadelphia . . . my heartfelt and my sincere thanks for this demonstration. . . ." Toward the end of his twenty-minute talk he apologized for being so long-winded: "Well, fellow-citizens, I did not intend to say as much as I have said. [Voices—'Go on, go on.'] There are other gentlemen who will be forced and compelled to make some remarks, and I said more than I intended to say. [Voices—'Say more.'] I will conclude. . . ."

The same thing happened the following day at Delmonico's Restaurant in New York City: "I shall not attempt,

in reference to what has been said and the manifestations that have been made, to go into any speech, or to make any utterance before you on this occasion, but merely to give utterance to the sincere sentiments of my heart."⁸

Constantly during his appearance in New York he was concerned about how long he was talking: "I shall not trespass upon you a moment," and again, "I will not detain you for a moment." Each time the cheers and cries of "Go on," "Bravo!" and "Good!" led him from one argument to the next. After he had talked an hour or more, followed by the playing of "The Star Spangled Banner," he rose to propose a toast: "Gentlemen, in conclusion, after having consumed more of your time than I intended, I fear unprofitably, let me propose, in sincerity, 'The Union, the perpetual Union of these States.'"

The *Chicago Republican* for August 31 made an astute observation after Johnson's evening address at Albany: "The President made a somewhat longer speech than he intended, but there, as elsewhere, it was difficult for him to stop when he had once begun." At Schenectady he repeated his pledge "Not . . . to make a speech."⁹ At Auburn after promising "half a dozen words—which shall conclude what I am going to say on this occasion," he proceeded to talk at least as many minutes.¹⁰ Twice almost in a single breath he told his Detroit audience that he had said two times, three times, as much as he intended.¹¹ Audiences at Springfield, Alton, Indianapolis, and Louisville heard similar statements.¹²

⁸ McPherson, pp. 129-134.

⁹ Associated Press dispatch to the *Dubuque (Iowa) Times*, Sept. 4.

¹⁰ *The National Republican* (Washington, D. C.), Sept. 3.

¹¹ *Chicago Republican*, Sept. 6.

¹² *Chicago Republican*, Sept. 10; *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, Sept. 10, 12; *Louisville Daily Journal*, Sept. 12.

⁶ Johnson had kept silent since his Washington's Birthday Speech (Feb. 22, 1866) from the Capitol steps.

⁷ *New York Daily Tribune*, Aug. 29. All newspaper sources are from 1866.

This "I do not intend to make a speech" and "I have already talked longer than I intended" approach continued to the end of his "Swing Around the Circle." At Baltimore, his last stop before returning to the nation's capital, he spoke so long that his special train was delayed and Washington crowds had a long and unexpected wait at the station.¹³ Even at Washington, like a gramophone that never ran down, Johnson was still playing his same record: "I have no speech to make to you tonight . . ." ¹⁴ He wanted to talk to the people, not to make a formal address to be printed in the newspapers, read by the people, studied and criticized by opposition senators and editors. He wanted to be brief, but, warmed to his subject, found it difficult to stop.

II. THE CLEVELAND WARNING

Early on his tour Johnson's audiences responded favorably.¹⁵ But Greeley's *Tribune* and other Radical papers picked up Johnson's impromptu remarks, twisted them, lifted them from context, or simply seized upon the natural slips any speaker makes when carried away by the warmth of the occasion. They mocked his favorite phrases, including "not for the purpose of making a speech."¹⁶

Especially as the presidential party neared Ohio's Western Reserve, the audiences turned colder and less responsive.¹⁷ On the morning of Monday, September 3, Ashtabula, Ohio, became the first city to refuse the President a hearing. As described by the *Chicago Republican* for September 4, the crowd was not ill-tempered, but "they simply did

not want to hear him. They laughed and talked, cheered for Grant and Farragut, and plainly showed that they wanted nothing."

Before Johnson and his party visited Cleveland, Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles and Ohio's Governor Tod warned against "impolitic and injudicious" impromptu addresses.¹⁸ The President should not make *any* speech under unfavorable circumstances. Was this too much to ask? Could Johnson content himself with polite nothings, greetings and platitudes and gratitude for the fine reception? Or with a smile and a wave of his hat?

Cleveland furnished just the occasion Welles and Tod feared. Probably with their warnings fresh in his ears, Johnson began by declaring to the huge crowd gathered Monday evening below the balcony of the Kennard House: "It is not for the purpose of making a speech that I now appear before you. . . . I repeat that I am not before you to make a speech, but simply to make your acquaintance—to say how are you and to bid you good-bye."¹⁹

The President's intentions seemed good. He saw the danger of which Tod and Welles warned, but found it difficult to stop short when a critical audience questioned his ideas. The spell of the late evening hour, flickering lights, immense crowd, balcony vantage point, heckling from the audience, all overcame his resistance and launched him into a major defense of his record and his reconstruction policies.

To his assertion that "if my predecessor had lived, the vials of wrath would have been poured out upon him," the crowd answered, "Never! Never!" Could Johnson turn back and admit defeat in the face of such criticism? Certainly

¹³ New York *Herald*, Sept. 16.

¹⁴ *The National Republican*, Sept. 17.

¹⁵ See for example the opposition *Chicago Republican*, Sept. 1.

¹⁶ See the cartoon by Thomas Nast in *Harper's Weekly*, X (Oct. 27, 1866), 680-681.

¹⁷ *Daily Morning Chronicle* (Washington, D. C.), Sept. 8.

¹⁸ *Diary of Gideon Welles* (Boston, 1911), II, 594.

¹⁹ *Cleveland Daily Leader*, Sept. 12.

not! His audience was there to be mastered and he would do that if it took all night.

His Cleveland audience, however, persisted in talking back. When the President remarked that he was there "for the purpose of exchanging views, and ascertaining, if he could, who was wrong," he got the answer: "You are!" One of his favorite rhetorical questions: "Who is he—what language does he speak—what religion does he profess—that can come and place his finger upon one pledge I ever violated or one principle I ever proved false to?" provoked replies like "New Orleans!" and "Why don't you hang Jeff Davis?" Before long the President became angry and accused Congress of "trying to break up the government." Hisses and cries of "A lie!" replied to this accusation, and one voice suggested, "Don't get mad!"

Asking that all "allay our passions and permit reason to resume her empire and prevail," Johnson insisted that "my intention was to address myself to your common sense, your judgment, your better feelings . . . and to say 'how dye' and 'good bye.'" Instead of matching words with action, however, he again took his cue from the crowd: "In the assembly here to-night the remark has been made 'traitor!'" Noise became too great at this point for the President to proceed. All the more reason for his continuing!

"'Traitor,' my countrymen! Will you hear me? [Cries, 'Yes!'] And will you hear me for my cause and for the constitution of my country?" Someone called out "Thad. Stevens!" and the President replied, "Why don't you hang Thad. Stevens and Wendell Phillips?"

Heckling continued, but Johnson faced his assailants and talked them down individually or en masse. Dignified! No! This speech was more like a rough-and-tumble fight than a state ad-

dress: "[Cries, 'Is this dignified?'] I understand you. You may talk about the dignity of the President. You may talk about his making a speech on the 22nd of July. [Voices, '22nd of February.'] 22nd of February. [Voices, 'The whisky said that.']"

After another prolonged interruption the President continued:

I care not for dignity. There is a certain portion of our countrymen who will respect a fellow-citizen wherever he is entitled to respect. [Voice: "That's so."] There is another class that have no respect for themselves and consequently they cannot respect any one else. [Laughter and cheers.] I know a man and a gentleman whenever I see him. I know a man whenever I look at him in the face. [Voice: "Which you can't do."] Come out where I can see you (to a man in the crowd). I will bet now that if the light was reflected upon your face, cowardice and treachery would be depicted upon it. [Laughter and cheers.] If you ever shot a man you will do it in the dark and pull the trigger when no one is by to see you. [Cheers.] . . . And those men—such a one as insulted me tonight—you may say, has ceased to be a man, and in ceasing to be a man shrunk into the denomination of a reptile, and having so shrunk—en as an honest man, I tread upon him. I came here to-night not to criminate or recriminate, but to defend, and when encroached upon, I care not from what quarter it comes, it will find resistance, and resistance at the threshold. . . .

You cannot frighten me. I never fear clamor. I have never been afraid of the people, for by them I have always been sustained . . . clamor nor affront, nor animosities can drive me from my purpose. . . .

I tell you, my countrymen here to-night, that though all the powers of hell and Thad. Stevens and his gang combined they could not turn me from my purposes. There is no power that could turn me except you and the God who spoke me into existence.

Repeated cheers showed that Johnson had friends as well as enemies in the crowd. On he went: "I love my country. Every public act of my life testifies that it is so. Where is the man that can put his finger upon any one act of mine that goes to prove to the contrary?"

And what is my offending?" To this rhetorical question at least one voice answered honestly, "Because you are not a Radical."

He tried to close but could not bring himself to do so. His customary peroration, complete with the all-too-familiar images of Constitution, flag, and "the entire circle of these States," came about one third of the way through his speech as recorded by the *Cleveland Daily Leader*. Even "In bidding you farewell to-night" could not stop him, and several minutes later he admitted: "But fellow-citizens, I have been drawn into this. I intended simply to make my acknowledgments for your cordial welcome, but if I am insulted I will resent it in a proper manner."

Unmercifully heckled by a crowd that more than once threatened to stop his speech entirely, President Johnson lost his dignity, stooped to the level of his tormentors, answered them in their own terms. The good resolutions with which he stepped onto the balcony of the Kenard House were thrown to the winds. Finally, after the damage had been done, he pulled himself together and closed on a conciliatory note.

The Radical press stormed. The President had abandoned all dignity and was dragging his high office into the muck and mire of partisan politics. In bandying words with the bullies and toughs of the crowd he showed himself unfit to be President.²⁰ Even the friendly New York *Times* editorialized about "The President's Mistake."²¹

III. RELUCTANCE OVERCOME AT ST. LOUIS

The full story of Johnson's troubles at Cleveland and the aftermath of that speech in Ohio and in the nation are beyond the scope of this paper. The

point now is that as the President headed west for Chicago and St. Louis he had an object lesson to reinforce the warnings of his friends. Impromptu addresses were dangerous.

Johnson spoke at Cleveland on Monday. The next few days were comparatively uneventful, a montage of travel by rail and boat, of speeches both long and short, of rain and cheering and mildly annoying heckling. The following Saturday, September 8, he faced a parallel situation in St. Louis. As he and his party were waiting for a ceremonial banquet of welcome at the Southern Hotel, a huge crowd gathered outside, demanding a speech.

Because Johnson's speeches at Cleveland and St. Louis were introduced as evidence at his impeachment trial, sworn testimony is available concerning the circumstances of his St. Louis speech. Two witnesses at the trial, members of the reception committee from the Merchants' Union Exchange, told the Senate of the President's reluctance to appear before the crowd outside the hotel. In this testimony from the trial record, Barton Able, collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri, provided the answers while Benjamin R. Curtis of the President's legal staff asked the questions:

Q. Were you present at the hotel before the speech was made?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. As one of the committee . . . ?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please to state under what circumstances the President was called upon to speak?

A. I was in one of the parlors of the hotel with the committee and the President, when some of the citizens came in and asked him to go out and respond to a call from the citizens to speak. He declined, or rather said that he did not care to make any speech. The same thing was repeated two or three times by other citizens coming in, and he finally said that he was in the hands of his friends, or of the committee, and if

²⁰ Editorial in the New York *Tribune*, Sept. 8; *Cleveland Daily Leader*, Sept. 5.

²¹ New York *Times*, Sept. 7.

they said so he would go out and respond to the call, which he did do.

Q. What did the committee say? Did they say anything?

A. A portion of the committee, two or three of them, said after some consultation that they presumed he might as well do it. There was a large crowd of citizens on the outside in front of the hotel.

Q. Did the President say anything before he went out as to whether he went out to make a long speech or a short speech. . . ?

A. My understanding of it was that he did not care to make a speech at all.

George Knapp, one of the publishers and proprietors of the *Missouri Republican* of St. Louis, corroborated Able's testimony:

Q. Please state what occurred between the President and the citizens, or the committee of citizens, in respect to his going out to make a speech?

A. The crowd on the outside had called repeatedly for the President, and some conversation ensued between those present. I think I recollect Captain Able and Captain Taylor and myself at any rate were together. The crowd continued to call. Probably someone suggested, I think I suggested, that he ought to go out. Some further conversation occurred, I think between him and Captain Able—

Q. The gentleman who has just left the stand?

A. Yes, sir; Captain Barton Able, and I think I said to him that he ought to go out and show himself to the people and say a few words at any rate. He seemed reluctant to go out, and we walked out together.²²

Responding to the demands of the crowd, the President began with a salutation to his "fellow citizens" and an insistence that he was being introduced to them "not for the purpose of making a speech."²³ Someone in the crowd caught up his "fellow citizens" salutation and asked: "How about British subjects?" In reply Johnson promised, "we will attend to John Bull after a while, so far as that is concerned."

Laughter and loud cheers greeted this sally.

Next someone called out, "Ten thousand welcomes," to which others added hurrahs and cheers. "Thank you, sir," said the President. "I wish it were in my power to address you under favorable circumstances upon some of the questions that agitate and distract the public mind at this time." He thought that "the time has arrived when we should have peace." So far, so good! The President might have bowed, left the balcony, and gone inside to the waiting banquet table without damage to his reputation or loss to his cause.

Many in the crowd below the hotel balcony did not agree with Johnson that the time for peace had come. Someone wondered how the riots at New Orleans fitted into Johnson's rosy picture and asked aloud, "New Orleans; go on." Johnson rose to the bait. Granted his temperament and confidence in his own ability in rough-and-tumble stump speaking, Messrs. Able and Knapp could scarcely have expected him to exercise self-restraint. "Perhaps if you had a word or two on the subject of New Orleans you might understand more about it than you do." One word led to another.

But when you talk about New Orleans and talk about the causes and consequences that resulted from proceedings of the kind, perhaps, as I have been introduced here, and you have provoked questions of this kind, though it doesn't provoke me, I will tell you a few wholesome things that have been done by this Radical Congress.

This led to the Judas Iscariot business ("If I had played the Judas, who has been my Christ that I have played the Judas with? Was it Thad. Stevens? Was it Wendell Phillips? Was it Charles Sumner").²⁴ What a wonderful oppor-

²² *Supplement to the Congressional Globe*, "The Trial of Andrew Johnson," 40th Cong., 2nd Sess., pp. 211-212.

²³ *Missouri Republican* (St. Louis), Sept. 9.

²⁴ This was probably provoked by Thaddeus Stevens in his Lancaster speech rather than by anyone in the immediate audience. Pamphlet in the *Stevens Manuscripts*, (Manuscript Division, Library of Congress), viii, 54196 et. seq.

tunity this gave the Radicals for accusations of sacrilege!

Next came "Moses," a reference to Johnson's promise in Nashville, Tennessee, that he would be the Moses for the Negro race.²⁵ "But let me tell you, let me give you a few words here tonight—and but a short time since I heard someone say in the crowd that we had a Moses." "Moses" led to emancipation, emancipation of the Negro to emancipation of the white man (one of Johnson's favorite subjects), and that to the Freedmen's Bureau. Where could the President stop?

I simply intended to-night to tender you my sincere thanks; but as I go along, as we are talking about this Congress and these respected gentlemen, who contend that the President is wrong, because he vetoed the Freedmen's Bureau Bill, and all this, because he chose to exercise the veto power he committed a high offense, and therefore ought to be impeached. [Voice: "Never!"]

From this discussion of the Freedmen's Bureau the speaker detoured easily to a direct attack upon Congress for its salary grab of \$4,000 as compared to the inadequate \$50 to \$100 bonus offered the veterans. From this digression a voice in the crowd recalled him: "Stick to the question." Johnson heeded immediately:

Fellow citizens, you are all familiar with the work of restoration. You know since the rebellion collapsed, since the armies were suppressed on the field, that everything that could be done has been done by the executive department of the government for the restoration of the government.

Again and again the speaker took his cue from his audience. A few minutes later he was arguing that the Constitution forbids depriving any state of its

equal suffrage in the Senate when a member of the crowd replied, "They have never been out." Promptly Johnson responded: "It is said before me: 'They have never been out.' I say so too, and they cannot go out."

Next the speaker turned to the pardoning power of the chief executive. A call from the audience wanted to know about Jeff Davis and his prospects for hanging. Johnson's answer was typical:

You call on Judge Chase to hang Jeff. Davis, will you? [Great cheering.] I am not the court, I am not the jury, nor the judge . . .

Why don't you hang Thad. Stevens and Wendell Phillips? [Great cheering.] A traitor at one end of the line is as bad as a traitor at the other.

In the immediate audience situation the attack upon Stevens and Phillips brought loud cheers; in the sober light of the following day many citizens all over the country must have wondered how far the President would go. Off-the-cuff answers like this were dangerous.

The President knew he was being intentionally heckled:²⁶

I know that there are some who have got their little pieces and sayings to repeat on public occasions, like parrots, that have been placed in their mouths by the superiors, who have not the courage and the manhood to come forward and tell them themselves, but have their understrappers to do their work for them.

"Bread and butter," the subject of patronage appointments, came next. Some conservative sympathizer in the crowd called "Kick 'em out," referring to opponents of presidential reconstruction still holding federal patronage jobs in post office, customs, or internal revenue. Promptly adopting the phrase,

²⁵ Robert Watson Winston, *Andrew Johnson, Plebian and Patriot* (New York, 1928), pp. 259-260. Cf. Clifton R. Hall, *Andrew Johnson, Military Governor of Tennessee* (Princeton, 1916), pp. 154-155. Hall questions the authenticity of this speech, saying, "It is impossible to get at exactly what Johnson said."

²⁶ Editor's note: In his "Andrew Johnson Loses His Battle," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, XI (1952), 291-328, Mr. Phifer presented evidence that the Radicals deliberately packed Johnson's audiences with hecklers who would provoke him to the kind of responses reported here.

Johnson promised to "kick them out" just as fast as he could.

At last Johnson began his elongated conclusion:

Let me say to you in concluding what I have said, and I intend to say but little, but was provoked into this, rather than otherwise, I care not for the threats; I do not intend to be bullied by my enemies nor overawed by my friends [cheers] . . .

The last phrase is difficult to understand apart from the description carried in the *Missouri Democrat* for September 10: "While Mr. Johnson was speaking, some of his friends, who crowded around him, tried by their gestures and their suggestions over his shoulder to get him to stop." The banquet was ready to begin. The *Democrat*, however, thought Andy's voice "very musical" to him "if to nobody else. . ."

Finally Johnson ended one of the longest speeches of his "Swing Around the Circle," and perhaps one of the best known,²⁷ by a restatement of his original purpose:

I thank you for the cordial welcome you have given me in this great city of the northwest, whose destiny no one can foretell. Now [Voice: "Three cheers for Johnson!"] then, in bidding you good-night, I leave all in your charge, and thank you for the cordial welcome you have given me in this spontaneous outpouring of the people of your city.

Thus Johnson's St. Louis speech, used against him in the impeachment trial, was drawn from him piece by piece by the friendly responsiveness and unfriendly questions of his audience. The hotel balcony, huge crowd, evening hour, and made-to-order speaking situation were too much for the sober judgment of the President and the warnings of his advisers. He found it easier to yield to the temptation of a crowd waiting to be mastered than to remain dis-

cretely silent or content himself with polite nothings.

IV. SUMMARY

When Johnson left Washington for his "Swing Around the Circle," he planned to make only informal talks, not formal addresses. Relying solely on general preparation, he carried with him neither manuscripts nor outlines. During his talks he took up each topic as it occurred to him or was suggested to him by his hearers.

After the honeymoon period early in his tour, Johnson found the Radicals in his audiences increasingly vocal. The give-and-take discussion he envisioned before leaving the White House proved impossible when on warm September evenings huge crowds gathered under hotel balconies under conditions of high tension and excitement. Taking advantage of the anonymity granted by the hour and the crowd, Radical sympathizers unmercifully heckled the President. When several increasingly unpleasant experiences reinforced the sober advice of Governor Tod and Secretary Welles, Johnson sought to avoid prolonged informal discussions under unfavorable conditions and to content himself, where necessary, with a polite word of greeting and thanks.

Such good resolutions were easier to make than to keep. Repeatedly Johnson let himself be carried away by the occasion. His Cleveland and St. Louis speeches approach the ultimate in audience adaptation as the situation—balcony, gas lights, torches, noisy crowd—drew him into long and contentious speeches. His topics were forced upon him by friendly and unfriendly calls from the crowd. Warming to his subject and faced by an audience willing and anxious to talk back, he could not admit defeat and leave his audience without a full defense of his policies.

²⁷ Reprinted in David J. Brewer, *The World's Best Orations* (Chicago, 1923), VII, 170-177; Chauncey M. Depew, *The Library of Oratory* (New York, 1902), VII, 364-380.

In one way or another every veteran campaigner faces Johnson's decision. Should modern presidential candidates, for example, abandon their ghost-written manuscripts and speak impromptu or nearly so; or should they limit their public utterances to prepared addresses? In 1866, granted the almost fanatical opposition of the Radicals and their control of the most powerful newspapers,²⁸ Johnson probably weakened the cause of presidential reconstruction by bandying epithets with hostile crowds under circumstances he could not hope to control. Impromptu addresses under those conditions led him into numerous traps too deep for quick escape.

²⁸ *The Nation*, II (March 15, 1866), 321. Frank Luther Mott, *American Journalism* (New York, 1942), p. 369.

No one ever denied that Johnson was excitable or that he had a sharp temper. Calmness and self-control were not among his cardinal virtues. But in a real sense his inability to remain silent in the face of danger to his beloved country motivated the Swing Around the Circle. And for Johnson it was not a choice between prepared manuscripts and impromptu talks. His informal stump speeches were the only kind for which training and experience prepared him. It was that or nothing, stump speeches or silence. And with northern Radicals intent upon a policy of retribution rather than reconciliation for the late secessionists, the President felt compelled to present the choice to the people and let them make the ultimate decision.

THE RELATIVE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF ENGLISH CONSONANT SOUNDS IN WORDS IN THE SPEECH OF CHILDREN IN GRADES ONE, TWO, AND THREE*

JOHN B. MADER
Mississippi Southern College

THE purpose of this investigation was to determine the relative frequencies with which the consonants of English occur initially, medially, and finally, in words used by children in grades one, two, and three, as indicated by individual recordings of directed conversations of children at these grade levels.

In the area of speech pathology there are two persistent questions: (1) how are we to determine progress for a person who is undergoing therapy for an articulatory problem? (2) for acceptable clinical experimentation, how may we assure ourselves of experimental and control groups that are adequately evaluated with reference to "severity" of articulatory defects?

Henrikson states that, "Degree of progress, however defined, will surely be a major criterion for determining the value of remedial procedures. Furthermore, the more specific the criteria of progress can be, the more valuable they may be, assuming, of course, that the criteria are valid and reliable."¹ Clinical experimentation with therapy for articulation disorders must assure itself of equated experimental and control groups. Any attempt to draw conclusions from research that fails at such control invites censure for violation of a basic rule of experimentation.

An evaluation of progress in articulation therapy may employ the knowledge of how frequently the various consonants normally occur in the speech of a given group. With this in mind we must investigate two aspects of the frequency of occurrence of consonant sounds: (1) how often does each sound occur regardless of position? (2) how often does each sound occur in the initial, medial, and final positions in words?

We will first discuss the importance of the frequency of occurrence of the sounds. There is a difference in the number of times that certain sounds occur as compared to the frequency with which certain other sounds occur. Thus an individual who misarticulates a sound that occurs with greater frequency has more articulatory errors than an individual who misarticulates a sound that occurs in our language less frequently and, therefore, might be said to have a more "severe" problem.

What of the position of occurrence of the various consonant sounds? Position is important, because we know that there are individuals who misarticulate certain sounds only in certain positions in words. The frequency of occurrence of the sounds by position provides us with data for a similar measure of "severity." If we are able to determine that differences exist in the frequency of occurrence of different sounds in one position,

*Based upon M.A. thesis, Florida State University, 1951, directed by Stanley Ainsworth.

¹"An analysis of Wood's Articulation Index," *Jour. Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 13 (1948), 233.

either initially, medially, or finally,² as compared to the frequency of occurrence of the same sound in another position of a word, then we might say that to have that sound in error in the *position* of greatest frequency of occurrence is to have a more "severe" disorder.

Thus knowledge of the relative frequencies and frequency of occurrence by position in words of each consonant sound will have practical value. Such knowledge will contribute to a measure of "severity" that will enable us to evaluate quantitatively the progress of therapy for articulatory problems in a speech clinic. It will also assist in securing equated groups for experiments with articulation therapies.

This study is an attempt to determine the relative frequencies at which the consonants occur initially, medially, and finally in words used by children in grades one, two, and three.

I. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The frequency of occurrence of the sounds and words of English-speaking people has been of interest to investigators for some time. Very few investigators, however, have been interested in relationship of these data to "severity" and articulation therapy.

According to Voelker,³ the first phonetician to make a study of the frequency of occurrence of speech sounds in English was W. O. Whitney. Whitney based his results on data taken from 10,000 sounds in connected speech, and used his own pronunciation with the exception of the [r] because he considered his own [r] was less extensive than usual.

² For example [s] is in an initial position in "see," medial in "also," and final in "pass."

³ C. H. Voelker, "A Comparative Study of Investigations of Phonetic Dispersion in Connected American English," *Archives Neerlandises de Phonetique Experimentale*, 13 (1937), 138-52.

Godfrey Dewey in a study designed to determine the relativ [sic] frequency of occurrence, in good English, as written and spoken today, of the various simple sounds and commoner sound combinations—sillables [sic] and words—of the English language,"⁴ selected his materials from newspapers, fiction, speeches, drama, short stories, personal and business correspondence, advertising copy, religious writings, and articles. According to Voelker he "cannot be said to have made a study of sounds of spoken material."⁵

In 1930, French, Carter, and Koenig⁶ did a study of the words and sounds of telephone conversations. Analyzing 79,390 words taken from the telephone conversations of men and women, they determined the frequency of occurrence of words, speech sounds, and combinations of sounds. This study includes a listing of the frequency of occurrence of the consonant sounds in the initial and final positions of words. The data were analyzed without regard to age or sex.

Travis presented a rank order of the frequency of occurrence of consonant sounds by individuals in casual conversation. He indicated the number and percentage of times each sound occurred.⁷ This investigation failed to take into consideration the occurrence of sounds by position. Travis concerned himself with the total number of times a given sound occurred regardless of position. His sample, 16,077 sounds in all, represents a total of about forty-five minutes of conversational speech.

⁴ Godfrey Dewey, *The Relativ Frequency of English Speech Sounds* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1923).

⁵ Voelker, pp. 138-52.

⁶ N. R. French, C. W. Carter Jr., and W. Koenig Jr., "The Words and Sounds of Telephone Conversations," *Bell System Technical Jour.*, 9 (April, 1930), 290-324.

⁷ Lee Edward Travis, *Speech Pathology* (New York, 1931).

Voelker, in an attempt "to determine what may be considered a norm for at least one type of fairly generally accepted 'careful,' cultural, or perhaps what we may better designate as 'formal' American pronunciation,"⁸ analyzed the relative frequency of occurrence of English sounds regardless of position. His raw data consisted of radio announcement speeches of several different types.

Wood formulated an articulation index based on Travis's statistics.⁹ This was an attempt to design a scale by which speech progress could be measured. Using the Travis frequency table, Wood gave each consonant sound a relative weight and prorated the weight equally for all positions in which the sound occurred. For example, since the relative weight of [t] is 12.0 per cent according to the Travis frequency table, then the initial, medial, and final [t] were given a weight of 4.0 per cent each. The basic assumption here was that each of the sounds occurred in the various positions of a word an equal number of times.

Henrikson, in a pilot study designed to test Wood's hypothesis, determined that, "prorating consonant sounds on the assumption that they occur equally or approximately equally in all positions in a word is not justified. . . . Using such a prorating as the basis for constructing an index of progress is not justified, and the value of conclusions drawn from using such an index is correspondingly questionable."¹⁰ Henrikson says of his own study, "This number of students and the amount of material recorded are not assumed to be

sufficient to supply normative data for the frequency of occurrence of sounds in various positions for children of different ages, types, and so forth."¹¹

If we are to develop an adequate rating of "severity" it is important that we know the relative frequencies of occurrence of the consonant sounds in the speech of children at a period that is important to proper speech development. These data are not presented, to the writer's knowledge, in any of the existing literature. This study is an attempt to provide that information.

II. PROCEDURE

Samples of directed conversation were collected from a total of 81 students enrolled in the first, second, and third grades of the Demonstration School of Florida State University. The experimental group consisted of 46 boys and 35 girls ranging in age from five to nine years. All available members of the three sections were used in the study. The data were collected in the Speech Clinic of the Demonstration School. The room was comfortable and familiar to the majority of the children used in the study.

The experimental procedure consisted of the following steps: (1) An individual interview was conducted with each subject. The children were brought into the room one or two at a time, comfortably seated and made familiar with the procedure. It was explained that we were collecting samples of conversation from all the children in the first, second, and third grades. All interviews were directed in the sense that questions were asked to initiate the conversation. The questions were directed toward such subjects as movies that had been enjoyable, trips that the subjects had made, and school activities. Once the conversation had begun fur-

⁸ Charles H. Voelker, "Phonetic Distribution in Formal American Pronunciation," *Jour. Acoustical Society of America*, V (1934).

⁹ Kenneth Scott Wood, "Parental Maladjustment and Functional Articulatory Defects in Children," *JSHD*, 11 (1946), 255-75.

¹⁰ Henrikson, pp. 233-34.

¹¹ Henrikson, pp. 233-34.

ther questions were asked only to keep the subject talking. Such questions were derived from comments that the subjects had made. All interviews were approximately ten minutes in duration. (2) All conversations were recorded on tape. (3) A typewritten copy was made of each conversation. This was carefully compared to the recording to insure proper copying of the conversation. (4) Each text was analyzed to determine the frequency and position of occurrence of each consonant sound in each position of the words used by the children. The information was recorded on a chart devised for that purpose. A total of 143,779 consonants was analyzed for this study.

Once the data were collected and recorded, the following factors were determined.

- a. The relative frequency of occurrence of each of the consonant sounds.
- b. The relative frequency of occurrence of the consonant sounds in each position of the word.
- c. The relative frequency of occurrence of the various consonant sounds with reference to the position of their occurrence in words used by children at these grade levels.

In phonetic analysis of sounds by position in words, the following definitions were used. The first sound in any word was termed the initial sound. The final sound in any word was termed the final sound. All sounds falling between the first and last sounds of a word were termed medial sounds.

For the purpose of this investigation [r] was considered as a consonant even when it appeared as a vowel or semi-consonant although each of these sounds is produced differently. Because of the difficulty of teaching such a distinction the speech correctionist usually works with [r] sounds as though they were alike. For this reason it is felt that a knowledge of the relative frequencies

of occurrence of [r], regardless of type, is important.

The compound consonant combinations such as [pr] and [str] were treated as individual consonant sounds, thus the word *street* was analyzed as: [s] initial, [t] medial, [r] medial, and [t] final.

All legitimate contractions were analyzed as contractions and not as separate words. Thus, if a child used the contraction *can't* it was analyzed as: [k] initial, [n] medial, and [t] final.

The first pronunciation listed in *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* was used in the analysis of all disputed words.

It was noted that the words [and] and [well] were used a great number of times. Although there are no data to indicate the frequency of occurrence of these words in ordinary conversation, it is thought that perhaps the rate of incidence of these two words in this study is somewhat high. Because of the nature of the directed conversations frequent questions were asked and the standard reply was "well . . ." etc. As the subjects moved from topic to topic the conjunction most often used was "and." The age of the subjects was undoubtedly also a factor in the frequent occurrence of "and." This may have affected the relative frequencies obtained for [w] in the initial position, [n] in the medial position, and [d] and [l] in the final positions.

III. RESULTS

A. *The relative frequency of occurrence of each of the consonant sounds.*

Table I indicates the relative frequencies of occurrence of the consonant sounds obtained in this study. An analysis of column A of this table indicates that five sounds: [n], [t], [d], [r], and [s] make up 49 per cent of the total occurrences of all sounds regardless of position of occurrence.

A further analysis of these data, not provided here in a tabular form, indicates that among boys, at all three grade levels, the proportions of the relative frequencies of occurrence of the consonants are identical for sixteen of the twenty-five sounds studied. Proportions of relative frequency of occurrence among the girls at the three grade levels are identical for eighteen of the twenty-five consonants studied. In no case, either among the boys or the girls at each grade level, is the proportional difference for any single consonant sound greater than 2 per cent.

An examination of the amount of agreement between boys and girls at each of the grade levels as to the proportion of total occurrence of each consonant sound indicates perfect agree-

ment in twelve of the twenty-five consonants studied. In no case is the proportional difference greater than 2 per cent.

Also, as a matter of interest, Table I offers a comparison of the relative frequencies of occurrence of the sounds in this study and the relative frequencies obtained by Voelker, Travis, and French, Carter, and Koenig. A rank order presentation of the most frequently occurring consonants in this study compare closely with those of Voelker and Travis. The difference in the results obtained in this study and those obtained by French, Carter, and Koenig may be due in part to the difference in material analyzed, and the ages of the subjects used in the investigations.

TABLE I
THE RELATIVE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE
OF ENGLISH SPEECH SOUNDS.

Sound	A Mader		B Voelker		C Bell		D Travis	
	Order	%	Order	%	Order	%	Order	%
n	1	13.14	1	11.86	2	10.99	2	10.3
t	2	11.74	2	11.67	1	13.77	1	13.7
d	3	10.25	4	8.28	4	7.30	5	7.3
r	4	7.83	3	11.62	3	8.76	3	8.8
s	5	6.50	5	7.55	8	5.50	4	7.4
ð	6	6.40	7	5.13	11	3.88	9	4.3
l	7	5.55	6	6.30	5	6.73	6	6.0
w	8	4.77	13	2.99	9	4.76	10	4.3
m	9	4.63	8	4.47	7	5.68	7	4.9
k	10	4.25	9	4.15	10	4.73	8	4.8
z	11	3.70	11	3.48	6	6.63	12	4.0
h	12	3.33	14	2.66	14	2.87	14	2.6
b	13	2.97	12	3.18	16	2.59	11	4.2
p	14	2.73	16	2.43	18	2.28	18	2.3
g	15	2.38	18	1.75	17	2.35	16	2.5
v	16	1.91	15	2.51	12	3.24	15	2.6
f	17	1.83	10	3.48	15	2.82	13	2.7
ŋ	18	1.61	19	1.68	20	1.97	19	1.9
ə	19	.93	21	1.06	19	2.06	21	1.2
ʃ	20	.84	20	1.63	21	1.30	20	1.9
j	21	.77	17	1.75	13	3.24	17	2.4
dʒ	22	.69						
hw	23	.56	23	.44	22	.91	22	.6
tʃ	24	.55						
ʒ	25	.01	22	.66	23	.73	23	.3

B. *The relative frequency of occurrence of the consonant sounds in each position of the word.*

Table II indicates the proportions of occurrence of each sound in each position for boys and girls in grades one, two, and three. An analysis of this table indicates that English consonant sounds do not occur equally or approximately equally in the initial, medial, and final positions of words. It was found that in all grades studied, five sounds [ð], [h], [w], [j], and [hw] occur in the initial positions over 90 per cent of the time, and that nine sounds occur in the initial position over 70 per cent of the time. One sound [z] occurs

in the final position over 90 per cent of the time. Only three sounds occur over 70 per cent of the time in the final position. The proportions for any sound were not recorded if the sound occurred less than .5 per cent of the time. If a sound is indicated as having a total proportion of .00 it does not indicate that the sound did not occur. Every sound was recorded at least once in every position it could be expected to occur except for [ʒ] in the final position.

C. *The relative frequency of occurrence of the various consonant sounds with reference to the position of their occurrence in words used by children at these grade levels.*

TABLE II
SOUNDS OCCURRING IN WORDS PRODUCED BY CHILDREN
IN GRADES ONE, TWO, AND THREE.

Sound	Proportion of Occurrence of Each Sound in the Initial, Medial, and Final Positions			Proportion of Occurrence of Each Sound as an Initial, Medial, or Final Sound		
	I	M	F	I	M	F
n	.07	.62	.31	.02	.31	.12
t	.22	.22	.55	.07	.10	.18
d	.15	.12	.73	.04	.05	.21
r	.14	.46	.40	.03	.14	.09
s	.50	.20	.30	.09	.05	.06
ð	.93	.07	.00	.16	.02	.00
l	.23	.41	.36	.03	.09	.06
w	.94	.06	.00	.12	.01	.00
m	.35	.26	.39	.04	.05	.05
k	.41	.29	.30	.05	.05	.04
z	.00	.06	.94	.00	.01	.10
h	.99	.01	.00	.09	.00	.00
b	.76	.23	.01	.06	.04	.00
p	.52	.23	.25	.04	.03	.02
g	.77	.13	.10	.05	.01	.01
v	.04	.36	.60	.00	.03	.03
f	.64	.17	.19	.03	.01	.01
ŋ	.00	.22	.78	.00	.01	.04
ə	.45	.22	.33	.01	.01	.01
ʃ	.76	.17	.07	.02	.01	.00
j	.98	.02	.00	.02	.00	.00
dʒ	.78	.12	.10	.02	.00	.00
hw	.98	.02	.00	.02	.00	.00
tʃ	.31	.24	.45	.01	.01	.01
ʒ	.00	1.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Total	1.02	1.04	1.04			

Table II indicates that in the initial position of words four sounds, [s], [ð], [w], and [h] make up 46 per cent of all initial sounds. This is true of all grades and both sexes. In the final positions of words, five sounds, [n], [d], [t], [r], and [z], make up over 69 per cent of all final sounds. This is true of all grades and both sexes.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. Five sounds make up approximately 50 per cent of the total occurrence of consonant sounds in the speech of children in grades one, two, and three.

These sounds are: [n], [t], [d], [r], and [s].

2. The consonants of English do not occur with equal frequency in the initial, medial, and final positions of words in the speech of children in grades one, two, and three.

3. Grade placement has little relation to the position of occurrence of the consonant sounds of English, among children in grades one, two, and three.

4. Sex has little relation to the frequency of occurrence of the consonant sounds of English, among children in grades one, two, and three.

THE LOUDNESS OF SIDE-TONE*

JOHN W. BLACK
The Ohio State University

THE signal at the speaker's ear, that is, his side-tone when he himself is speaking into a communication system, may be of the same level as the signal at the other headset positions in the circuit. This situation prevailed in the simulated intercommunication system of the present experiment.

The side-tone or auditory feedback provides the principal signal by which the speaker monitors his level; apparently he tends to maintain an experience of loudness that he considers "normal," "satisfactory," or perhaps "comfortable." As side-tone is altered, voice level is varied inversely in the approximate ratio of 1 db of voice level to 6 db of side-tone attenuation.¹ When temporary hearing loss or threshold shift is experienced the level of the voice is raised, and as normal hearing returns the level of voice is lowered.² In a somewhat related manner, the level of the speaking voice is a function of the reverberation characteristics of the room, a dead room eliciting a higher sound

pressure level of speech than a live room.³

The tendency for a speaker to establish and maintain a "normal" level of side-tone was the principal rationale for an exploratory study in which the operator's vocal responses to alternative microphone and headset combinations in the side-tone circuit were tested.

I. PROCEDURE

Twenty-four males with normal hearing served individually as experimental subjects. Each speaker, after producing a side-tone with either of two microphones and a headset comprised of PDR-3 earphones, was asked to re-establish or match this side-tone in level as a recording of it was fed to his ears intermittently and as he spoke the same phrase both with the original headset-microphone combination and alternative equipment. The experimental task and the treatment of the data were in keeping with the psychophysical method of average error. The comparisons were made both in quiet and in 114 db of noise—eight matching combinations. The experimental room was sound treated and had a reverberation time of 0.145 second.

A single five-syllable phrase was spoken several times while the magnetic tape recorder in the circuit was adjusted to optimum recording level (Amplex model 400). One saying of the

*This study was conducted at the U. S. Naval School of Aviation Medicine, N.A.S., Pensacola, Fla., under a contract between the Office of Naval Research and the Ohio State University Research Foundation.

¹C. Lightfoot and S. N. Morrill, "Loudness of Speaking: The Effect of the Intensity of Side-Tone Upon the Intensity of the Speaker," *Joint Project Rept. no. 4*, Joint Project, Kenyon Coll. and U. S. Nav. Sch. of Av. Med. (Pensacola, 1949), The Bur. of Med. and Surg. Proj. NM 001 053.

²J. W. Black, "The Effect of Noise-Induced Temporary Deafness Upon Vocal Intensity," *Joint Project Rept. no. 7*, Joint Project, Ohio State Univ. Res. Found. and U. S. Nav. Sch. of Av. Med. (Pensacola, 1951). The Bur. of Med. and Surg. Proj. NM 001 064.01.07.

³J. W. Black, "The Effect of Room Characteristics Upon Vocal Intensity and Rate," *Jour. Acoustical Society America*, XXII (1950), 174-176.

phrase was recorded on a loop of tape. Half of the subjects read the phrase over one microphone and half over the other. The single recorded signal was played back to the speaker ten times at three-second intervals, the playback system delivering the same voltage at the earphones as the original level of the sidetone of the speaker. With each re-playing through the ten trials, the speaker attempted to match the level of his side-tone as he repeated the phrase to the constant level of the playback of

back ten times, the reliability of the combination of (1) the playback of the tape recorder and (2) the graphic recorder was readily obtained. The standard deviation of the "phrase values" (mean of three peaks) was determined for each of twenty-four subjects. The median standard deviation of the twenty-four values was 0.5 db.

The combinations of headsets and microphones that were employed and the circumstances under which the recorded side-tones were matched were:

	QUIET		Noise (114 db)	
	Microphone	Headset	Microphone	Headset
Combination One	Narrow-band	Broad-band	Narrow-band	Broad-band
Combination Two	Narrow-band	Narrow-band	Narrow-band	Narrow-band
Combination Three	Broad-band	Broad-band	Broad-band	Broad-band
Combination Four	Broad-band	Narrow-band	Broad-band	Narrow-band

the recorded stimulus. The relative levels of both the original recording and the "matched side-tone" at the speaker's earphones were indicated on a power level recorder that was bridged across the circuit (Sound Apparatus Company; 50 db potentiometer; 50 mm/second).

The microphones used through these experiments were the hand-held service carbon microphone RS-38 which is described in the present comparison as *narrow-band*, and a commercial condenser microphone, the Altec 21-B, described herein for purposes of comparison as *broad-band*. Similarly the alternative headsets are referred to as *broad-band* and *narrow-band*, these instruments being respectively the PDR-3 earphones (with doughnuts) and a pair of Maico hearing aid receivers in earpieces that were individually fitted to the subjects' ears.

The mean value of three maximum excursions of the stylus of the graphic recorder in its response to the phrase was taken as a measure of the relative sound pressure level of a spoken phrase. Since the stimulus phrase that had been recorded for each speaker was played

II. RESULTS

The mean difference (db) between the voltage level of the signal that was heard by the speaker and the matching side-tone that he produced was determined from the graphic level recordings. The means of these differences for the eight experimental conditions are enumerated in Table I. A positive entry in the table indicates that the matching side-tone was higher in level than the stimulus, and a negative value that the matching side-tone was "low." In six of the eight conditions the speakers generated more voice signal in the matching process than they thought they were producing. The maximum difference among the means of the responses that was presumably attributable to the equipment combinations amounted to approximately 5 db both in quiet and in noise.

Under the assumption that the distinguishing feature between the two microphones was band width, the comparison in Table II is indicated. This table shows the arithmetic difference between the obtained "error values" or "mismatches" that are listed in Table I and which pertain to different micro-

phones and the same headsets. Thus, *combination three (quiet) minus combination one* $\Rightarrow +2.19 \text{ minus } (-0.72) = 2.91$. The values in Table II indicate that in the *quiet* or "better" listening condition the side-tone levels that "matched" the stimulus signals were of greater pressure magnitude when the side-tone signal was transmitted by a broad-band microphone; in the *noise* condition the opposite circumstance obtained.

A comparison similar to the one described in the preceding paragraph is presented in Table III in which the entries are differences between headsets, with microphones constant. Thus, *combination one minus combination two (quiet)* $= -0.72 \text{ minus } (-2.53) = 1.81$. In three of the four comparisons that are summarized in Table III the

"matched" side-tone levels were higher in level when the broad-band headset was in the system than when the narrow-band headset was in the system.

In three of the four combinations of equipment the magnitude of the error in establishing the level of side-tone in *noise* was greater than the comparable error in *quiet*. These differences can be observed through comparing the values within the rows of Table I.

The arithmetic differences between the voltages (db) at the earphone of the heard and spoken signals were determined for the successive pairs of stimulus-response combinations. This procedure yielded ten values for each speaker. These were arranged in a row with columns representing successive performances. There were twenty-four rows; each represented an experimental

TABLE I
MEAN DIFFERENCE (db) BETWEEN THE SOUND PRESSURE LEVEL OF
A HEARD PHRASE AND THE "MATCHED" SIDE-TONE.
Trials per S, 10; Ss, 24.

	Microphone	Headset	Quiet	Noise
Combination 1	Narrow-band	Broad-band	-0.72	+5.91
Combination 2	Narrow-band	Narrow-band	-2.53	+3.94
Combination 3	Broad-band	Broad-band	+2.19	+0.99
Combination 4	Broad-band	Narrow-band	+1.08	+3.74

TABLE II
MEAN DIFFERENCE (db) BETWEEN THE "MATCHED" SIDE-TONE LEVELS
WHEN THE SIDE-TONE WAS TRANSMITTED *via* A BROAD-BAND MICROPHONE
AND WHEN IT WAS TRANSMITTED *via* A NARROW-BAND MICROPHONE.
(BROAD-BAND MICROPHONE OF TABLE I *minus* NARROW-BAND
FOR HEADSETS SEPARATELY.)

	Headset	Quiet	Noise
Combination 3 minus 1	Broad-band	2.91	-4.92
Combination 4 minus 2	Narrow-band	3.61	-0.20*

*Only the value 0.20 is not significant at the 5% level of confidence.

TABLE III
MEAN DIFFERENCE (db) BETWEEN THE "MATCHED" SIDE-TONE LEVELS
WHEN THE SIDE-TONE WAS RECEIVED *via* BROAD-BAND AND NARROW-BAND HEADSETS.
(BROAD-BAND HEADSETS OF TABLE I *minus* NARROW-BAND HEADSET
FOR MICROPHONE SEPARATELY.)

	Microphone	Quiet*	Noise*
Combination 3 minus 4	Broad-band	1.11	-2.75
Combination 1 minus 2	Narrow-band	1.81	1.97

*All values are significant at the 5% level of confidence.

subject. Analysis of variance did not indicate a significant change in the stimulus-response relationship with successive performances. Thus, less than ten performances per individual might have been used. Also, this analysis would indicate that the speaker's adjustment to the level of response was apparently made rapidly.

III. DISCUSSION

In a closed system at the ear such as prevailed in this comparison the stimulus for the side-tone experience could arrive only through the headsets and through bone conduction, i.e. bone, tissue, etc. Moreover, in such a coupling the bone-conducted side-tone is typically amplified.⁴ Thus, there might be reason for supposing that internally transmitted side-tone would summate with the side-tone from the headset and that an illusory "matched" level would be less intense physically than the stimulus signal. The possibility remains that this occurs, particularly in *quiet*, in view of the inconclusive values in *quiet* of Table I. However, the preponderance of the evidence indicates that speakers simply underestimate the level of their speech. Other possibilities consistent with the measurements will be suggested.

Although the difference between the two microphones relevant to the present comparison was presumably in their frequency response, the possibility must not be overlooked that consequent and secondary dissimilarities such as harmonic, phase, and amplitude distortion may have operated. The subjects could compensate for such differences as dynamic range and sensitivity to signal strength. The capacity of each microphone to match the stimulus signal was assured, the stimulus signal having been fed

through each microphone by the speakers. (The matching process held the possibility for a "time error," the matching response always being made *after* the stimulus had been heard.)

A. *Quiet* In *quiet* the broad-band microphone conveyed more level than did the narrow-band when the side-tone was "matched" to the stimulus. Thus, when "matched," the narrow-band microphone delivered less sound pressure to the earphones than there "should have been." This average error could have been contributed by a bone-conducted component or by the distortion properties of the microphone. With the broad-band microphone (*combinations three and four, quiet*) the speaker delivered more sound pressure to the ear than he supposed. Since the experimental condition was *quiet*, the "error" pressure had to originate in speech, not in room noise such as entered the system *in noise*. By definition this microphone carried more high frequencies than the narrow-band microphone. A possible explanation is that in addition to the side-tone stimulus for the monitoring of loudness—presumably much the same for the two microphones—the power of "other" speech frequencies, higher ones, affected the meters and not the speaker-listener. Alternative explanations might include the possibility that the loudness-level function was affected by certain response peaks or other inherent properties of distortion.

B. *Noise* The consistent "over shooting" of the speakers under the noise conditions is apparent in the values of the right-hand column of Table I. Possibly with the experimental task the speakers tended to mask competing noise. Alternatively, the speaker may have gauged the proper level better than is indicated, and the room noise at the microphone may have accounted for his error. The better matching occurred

⁴ N. A. Watson and R. S. Gales, "Bone Conduction Threshold Measurements: Effects of Occlusion, Enclosures, and Masking Devices," *Jour. Acoustical Society America*, XIV (1943), 207-215.

with the broad-band microphone in the system.

C. *Equipment* As a functional test of equipment the procedure outlined in this comparison provides a measure that may be of value. There is parallel performance between the broad-band microphone and headset, and between the narrow-band microphone and headset. In both of the *quiet* conditions and in one condition of *noise* the broad-band headset delivered more energy to the ear during a subjectively "matched" circumstance than did the narrow-band receivers. From another view and particularly with respect to the *quiet* conditions, it is noteworthy that when all equipments appeared to be "equally loud," the broad-band microphone and headset were transmitting more power. The fact that the narrow-band equipments yielded "extra" loudness with less signal strength is not only in line with a frequency-response explanation but also with the common experience that distorted acoustic signals may appear to be more intense than they are.

IV. CONCLUSION

The purpose of the present comparison was twofold. First, the direction and

magnitude of the speaker's errors in evaluating his side-tone was under test. The tentative conclusion, independently of whether broad-band or narrow-band equipment was used, is that the speaker who is using an electrical communication system usually puts more external side-tone to his ear than he thinks he does. Of course, there is little reason to suppose that this behavior is limited to electrical systems. Second, the effect of equipment upon the judgment of side-tone level was under test. Without *a priori* knowledge and certainty of whether a broad-band microphone is superior to a narrow-band in military applications, there is at least reason to believe that the same general effects result from the band-width characteristics, whether narrow or broad, in either headsets or microphones. Broad-band and narrow-band equipments lead to distinctly different evaluations of equal side-tone sound pressure level on the part of the human monitor. These results, in turn, are consistent with the subjectively observed association of a higher than actual sound level pressure judgment with the distortion characteristic of narrow-band equipment.



SPEECH MONOGRAPHS—INDEX TO VOLUME XXI

Authors and Articles

- Auer, J. Jeffery. Doctoral Dissertations in Speech: Work in Progress, 1954. 136.
- Beighley, K. C. An Experimental Study of the Effect of Three Speech Variables on Listener Comprehension. 248.
- Black, John W. The Loudness of Side-Tone. 301.
- Caplan, Harry, and King, Henry H. Dutch Treatises on Preaching: A List of Books and Articles. 235.
- Caplan, Harry, and King, Henry H. Scandinavian Treatises on Preaching: A Book-List. 1.
- Cromwell, Harvey. The Persistency of the Effect on Audience Attitude of the First versus the Second Argumentative Speech of a Series. 280.
- Dahle, Thomas L. An Objective and Comparative Study of Five Methods of Transmitting Information to Business and Industrial Employees. 21.
- Dow, Clyde W. Abstracts of Theses in the Field of Speech, IX. 142.
- Edney, Clarence W. Richard Whately on *Dispositio*. 227.
- Fletcher, William W. Vocal Fold Activity and Sub-Glottic Air Pressure in Relation to Vocal Intensity: A Brief Historical Review. 73.
- Haberman, Frederick W., ed. A Bibliography of Rhetoric and Public Address for the Year 1953. 79.
- King, Henry H. *See* Caplan.
- Knower, Franklin H. Graduate Theses—An Index of Graduate Work in Speech and Drama, XXI. 108.
- Lomas, Charles W. The Orator and the Vigilante in San Francisco, 1856. 46.
- Mader, John B. The Relative Frequency of Occurrence of English Consonant Sounds in Words in the Speech of Children in Grades One, Two, and Three. 294.
- Mattingly, Alethea Smith. The Playing Time and Manner of Delivery of Shakespeare's Plays in the Elizabethan Theatre. 29.
- Nadeau, Ray. Talaeus versus Farnaby on Style. 59.
- Paulson, Stanley F. The Effects of the Prestige of the Speaker and Acknowledgment of Opposing Arguments on Audience Retention and Shift of Opinion. 267.
- Phifer, Gregg. "Not for the Purpose of Making a Speech:" Andrew Johnson's Swing Around the Circle. 285.
- Pitt, Carl Allen. An Analysis and Criticism of the 1940 Campaign Speeches of Wendell L. Willkie. 64.
- Richards, Gale L. A Case Study in Deliberative Persuasion: John Marshall's Congressional Speech on Jonathan Robbins. 254.
- Sheehan, Joseph G., and Voas, Robert B. Tension Patterns During Stuttering in Relation to Conflict, Anxiety-Binding, and Reinforcement. 272.
- Siegenthaler, Bruce M. Perception of Certain Phonetic Variables. 39.
- Voas, Robert B. *See* Sheehan.
- White, Eugene E. The Protasis of the Great Awakening in New England. 10.

Subject Index

FUNDAMENTALS OF SPEECH

Abstracts	142
Audience, effect on attitudes of	280
Audience, effect on comprehension of	248
Audience, effect on retention and opinion of	267
Consonants, frequency in children's speech	294
Phonetic variables, perception of	39
Side-tone, loudness of	301
Vocal fold activity	73

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

Abstracts	162
Bibliography of, for 1953	79
Information, methods of transmitting	21

Johnson, Andrew: campaign speaking	285	Gould, Harold Vernon	192
Marshall, John: Congressional speaking	254	Graham, A. Bruce	209
Preaching: Dutch treatises on	235	Grant, David McMurray	169
Preaching: Scandinavian treatises on	1	Graves, Russell Briggs	193
Style: Talaeus versus Farnaby	59	Grimes, Wilma H.	170
Vigilante orators in San Francisco	46	Hallauer, John William	194
Whitefield, George: preaching of	10	Haney, William V.	145
Willkie, Wendell: campaign speaking	64	Hansen, Burrell F.	187
INTERPRETATIVE READING		Hartwig, Gilbert Frederick	193
Abstracts	184	Highlander, John Palmer	188
RADIO AND TELEVISION		Hildreth, Richard A.	146
Abstracts	185	Hillbrunner, Anthony	170
THEATRE		Hoffman, Elsie	171
Abstracts	190	Hood, Philip N.	209
Shakespeare's plays, playing time of	29	Hudson, Roy Fred	172
SPEECH AND HEARING DISORDERS		Hyman, Melvin	147
Abstracts	205	Ingram, Oscar Harvey	148
Stuttering, tension patterns in	272	Karnis, Michael V.	194
SPEECH EDUCATION		Kessler, Ralph E.	210
Abstracts	220	King, Paul T.	211
Graduate theses index	108	Kleckner, Donald Charles	172
Research in progress	136	Knauf, Vincent Herbert	212
		Krempel, Daniel Spartakus	195
		Lencione, Ruth Mary	213
		Lengfeld, Lorna Seabury	148
		Leutenegger, Ralph Raymond	214
		Linke, Charles Eugene	149
		Linton, Bruce A.	189
		McEvoy, J. Edward	151
		Malamuth, Lorie Eck	150
		Manion, Orville Gayle	151
		Martin, Robert C.	173
		Maxwell, Keith Lawrence	214
		Merritt, Francine	224
		Moulton, Eugene R.	174
		Mudd, Charles Sumner, Jr.	175
		Mulder, Robert L.	152
		Muldrow, Blanche	196
		Murrish, Walter H.	224
		Ness, Ordean Gerhard	176
		Nicholas, Wayne A.	177
		Nilsen, Thomas R.	153
		North, Ira Lutts	177
		Palmer, John Milton	215
		Parker, Charles D.	215
		Parker, Mary-Braeme	154
		Parkhurst, Charles Edward	197
		Peckarsky, Adeline	216
		Penn, Jacques Paul	217
		Peters, Robert William	155
		Peterson, Ralph W.	197
		Pitt, Carl Allen	178
		Pfaff, Paul L.	155
		Ptacek, Paul H.	156
		Ralph, David Clinton	178
		Reardon, William Robert	198
		Richardson, Genevieve	199
		Ruechelle, Randall C.	157

Authors of Abstracts

Ackley, John William	220
Albright, Robert W.	220
Archer, Russell Bennett	221
Barber, G. Bradford	222
Bain, Jack M.	162
Becker, Samuel Leo	185
Blank, William Earl	190
Boehmler, Richard McDowell	205
Borman, Ernest G.	163
Brack, Harold Arthur	164
Brandes, Paul D.	165
Breniman, Lester R.	223
Brown, Irvin	205
Bryan, Martin	166
Carlton, Robert L.	142
Carr, Elizabeth Ball	143
Cathcart, Robert S.	167
Chreist, Fred Martin	206
Clark, Warren J.	207
Cripe, Nicholas McKinney	167
Davidson, Frank Costellow	190
Dorlag, Arthur Henry	191
Epstein, Aubrey	143
Ewbank, Henry L., Jr.	144
Fest, Thorrel Brooks	186
Garrison, Geraldine	208
Golden, James Lawrence	168

INDEX

309

192	Sawyer, Thomas Mitchell, Jr.	158	Thurman, Wayne L.	219
209	Scanlon, Paul Francis	200	Trotter, William David	218
169	Silverstein, Bernard	218	Vanderpool, William Sherman	182
193	Skillman, Billy Gerald	158	Vinocour, Seymour M.	183
170	Smith, Herbert Leigh	200	Wagner, Hilda Stahl	202
194	Smith, William Stephen	179	Warfield, J. W.	203
145	Snyder, William W.	201	Weinberg, Harry L.	161
187	Stanback, Thurman Willis	201	Weintraub, Stanley A.	184
193	Stout, Sarah Janette	225	Wilson, Carl Leon	181
188	Stromer, Walter Francis	159	Winship, Frank Loren	226
146	Svanoe, Harold C.	180	Wiseman, Ira Gordon	184
170	Tew, Roy Edwards	160	Withey, Joseph Anthony	204
171	Thurman, A. L., Jr.	180	Zedler, Empress Young	162
209				
172				
147				
148				
194				
210				
211				
172				
212				
195				
213				
148				
214				
149				
189				
151				
150				
151				
173				
214				
224				
174				
175				
152				
196				
224				
176				
177				
153				
177				
215				
215				
154				
197				
216				
217				
155				
197				
178				
155				
156				
178				
198				
199				
157				



